

E 6582

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

August 4, 1969

THIS UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM AT
CHAPEL HILL

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from a respected educator from my own district who has just returned from a so-called "Scientific Institute," conducted at the University of North Carolina under the auspices of the National Science Foundation.

I realize that both the scientific and the educational organizations have ways of retaliating against members who seek to give the public a picture of what is going on. I have, therefore, deliberately deleted my constituent's name and his address. I did this of my own volition and not at his request. He put his name on the copy which I received.

This House has just voted billions of dollars for education and I supported the appropriation. I know the need for education. I know the need for scientific advancement, but I cannot believe that it is necessary that we abandon all efforts at what we have historically considered common courtesy or ordinary decency. I am not sure that a little culture is not as important in human relations as is the scientific progress to which this institute was supposedly dedicated. The letter from my constituent is self-explanatory and is included herewith:

HON. W. R. POAGE,
Representative 11th Texas District,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POAGE: I realize you are busy and have little time for communication, but I feel that I need to inform you of a situation concerning a federally financed education program I observed this summer. I was a participant in a National Science Foundation Summer Institute at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill this summer. As a result of this, we were housed in a dormitory on the campus with a group of upward bound students.

I am a teacher and have completed nineteen years of teaching so I have had an opportunity to observe educational programs and judge their results before. I would like to make the following comments about the upward bound program at Chapel Hill.

First, if there was adult supervision, it was not evident. I was told that there were counselors but the adults I saw with the group more nearly fit my description of a pusher or hippy.

Second, as a result of the first statement, the dorm came to resemble a flop house, evidenced by the fact that they had to move furniture out of the lobby; floors were always littered with trash; walls of elevators were marked up and words usually found only on rest room walls were quite abundant.

Third, it became almost impossible to study in dorm any where except on upper floors. This did not change even after repeated complaints to dorm management.

Fourth, the language used by this group became such that very few people other than these students ever used the snack bar, T.V. room or other facilities in dorm.

Fifth, at least two meetings were held in the dorm with the speaker being a known militant from Durham, N.C. who had been very outspoken in the trouble at Greensboro and Chapel Hill in the spring of the year. After both of these meetings dorm windows and car windows were broken and things

stolen from both rooms and cars according to the dorm management.

Sixth, on at least one occasion I observed a gun being passed from person to person in lobby of dorm.

In short, I feel that the program accomplished a very good job of training a group of campus rebels. I feel that if you could check, you will find many of your future trouble makers received their training in this and related programs. I resent any of my tax money being used in such a poorly supervised program and feel that something should be done from a federal level.

There are many other things I would like to tell you about this summer but I realize you are busy and it is difficult to write about all the things I observed. If I can provide additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Cuba

THE COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT IN
CUBA

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, lately we have heard many urge us to look more favorably on the Communist Government in Cuba. According to the Castro apologists, the Cuban social experiment is taking form, and the Cuban people are feeling the benefits of the first social revolution in Latin America. The facts as presented in the U.S. News & World Report of August 4 contradict this illusion of social advancement and put the Castro regime in proper context: the Cuban Communist social revolution is taking form, and it has turned out to be a colossal flop.

Fidel Castro is in trouble, and he is turning to his old friend, the Soviet Union, for help. Consequently, it would be in our best interests to stop the talk of loosening the Cuban embargo and showing sympathy for the Cuban dictator. Quite obviously, Cuba's Communist Government is failing to meet the needs of the people, and repressive controls are being tightened. This does not sound to me like the work of a social revolution, and the U.S. Government should not be fooled into accepting this false picture. We should do everything in our power to help make the demise of Castro a reality.

To clear the air on the condition of Cuba's Government and to illustrate the need for a tightening of controls within the embargo area, I ask all Senators to consider carefully the article published in U.S. News & World Report. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of the Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR CASTRO: TIGHTER SOVIET TIES AS
POPULARITY EBBS

Fidel Castro—who for a decade has promised the Cuban people a better life—is apparently in so much trouble economically that he is being forced to overhaul his own policies for now.

Along with this, the popularity of the Cuban dictator is at an all-time low, according to U.S. Government sources.

The Russians—whom Castro once courted, then quarreled with—provided one of the most recent signs that policy gears are being shifted in Havana.

On July 20, seven Soviet warships sailed into Havana harbor, cheered by thousands of Cubans brought out to greet the vessels. The week's visit coincided with July 26 celebrations of the sixteenth anniversary of Castro's first armed revolutionary attack.

Little more than a year ago, Havana and Moscow were locked in a bitter name-calling contest. And 18 months ago, Castro kicked out two Russian and three Soviet-bloc diplomats for plotting against him with old-line Cuban Reds.

NEED FOR AID

At this time, in Castro's view, Soviet-Cuban friendship seems the best policy, say the experts. Castro desperately needs continued Russian aid to keep the Cuban economy going.

Though Castro—once the idol of the Cuban people—is not held in such high esteem at the moment, observers point out that he remains in firm control.

Still, work slowdowns, anti-Castro wall signs and low-level sabotage are appearing more frequently.

These things, caused mostly by shortages of food and other items, have resulted in tightened police controls.

From refugees, diplomats, official Cuban statements and various other sources come reports of arrest and unorganized resistance. For example:

Veteran sugar-cane workers are said to be cutting only about 40 per cent of the amount of cane they once cut;

A student says anti-Castro signs appear almost nightly on the walls inside Havana University, with indications that many people are involved;

Theft, robbery, swindling and crimes against property are officially reported to be on the upswing. Many of these crimes are considered to be sabotage;

Houses are being robbed when women leave them to stand in food queues;

Troubles have increased at night, and citizen bicycle patrols are being used.

As further evidence of a revamped policy, diplomatic and other sources noted that—at least up to the time of the July 26 celebrations—Castro had not, for a year or more, called publicly for armed revolution in other Latin-American countries.

Some, including a Castro agent who defected, say the Russians demanded, in exchange for more aid, that Havana halt the campaign. The thinking is that Castro was hurting the Russians' efforts to penetrate the Hemisphere in the role of peace lovers seeking only trade and diplomatic relations.

Just how true this is, of course, is difficult to determine. However, Castro has now declared that there can be a real revolution in Latin America without violence. On July 14, he said the military junta in Peru may be conducting such a revolution.

TURNING POINT

One U.S. expert on Hemisphere affairs described this statement as a true "turning point" in Cuban policy. Basically this switch can be laid to two failures, in the view of several American authorities. These are the economic failure and the failure to export revolution. Says one source:

"Castro was shaken up more than most people realize by the failure of Ernesto ('Ché') Guevara in Bolivia. Personal ties aside, what hurt Castro was that the Guevara effort failed even though all the classic conditions for revolt—in the Castro ideology—were present in Bolivia. But it didn't work, and that shook up Castro."

Another, in commenting on the economic aspects, was careful to point out that, though unrest is widespread in Cuba, "as yet, resistance is passive, not active or organized."

August 4, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 6581

spots the fiery glow of Apollo 11's heat shield as it streaks through the early morning (6:38 a.m. local time) sky.

12:39 p.m.: Radio blackout ends.

12:44 p.m.: At 23,300 feet, two drouge parachutes pop out to slow Apollo 11.

12:45 p.m.: Apollo 11's three main parachutes open.

12:49 p.m.: Apollo 11 is at 1,500 feet, swinging gently beneath its bright orange-and-white canopies.

12:50 p.m.: "Splashdown," a rescue helicopter reports. "Apollo has splashdown." The space craft plunges into the Pacific nose first, 13 miles from the recovery ship U.S.S. Hornet. Man's first flight to walk upon the moon ends upside down.

A.M. & N. PROGRAM AIMS AT ELIMINATING HARD-CORE POVERTY

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Arkansas A.M. & N. College, in Pine Bluff, is currently conducting a program to provide training, and then employment, for unskilled and unemployed people from Lonoke, Desha, and Drew Counties in Arkansas. This program, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and administered by the Arkansas Farmers Union, has been very successful and recently was the subject of a fine article in the Pine Bluff Commercial by Miss Janey Joyce.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A.M. & N. PROGRAM AIMS AT ELIMINATING HARD-CORE POVERTY (By Janey Joyce)

"Hard-core poverty."

This is a phrase used from time to time by sociologists and by government officials as they despair about the steadily rising costs of welfare and the high numbers of unemployed or underemployed people who are not sharing in the current prosperity in the United States.

Who are the "hard-core" poor?

They are the people who have been left behind in this fast-paced technical society. They vary from place to place.

In Southeast Arkansas they are most often displaced farm workers. They are the people who were tenant farmers, sharecroppers or field hands before the mechanical age reached agriculture.

They grew up expecting to chop cotton in the spring and to pick cotton in the fall. That's all they ever expected to need to know how to do.

Now, however, cotton is chopped with herbicides and it is picked by machines. The traditional agricultural jobs are no longer available.

But many of the people who used to do those jobs are still living in the tumble-down paintless shacks that dot the rural areas of Southeast Arkansas. They subsist on welfare and the proceeds from occasional unskilled jobs.

Their children have often grown up assuming that this was the only way of life available to them as well.

Two years ago the Arkansas Farmers Union in Little Rock began a program at Arkansas

AM&N College in an attempt to provide training, and then employment, for unskilled and unemployed people living in Lonoke, Desha and Drew Counties.

The program was funded by a grant from the federal Office of Economic Opportunity with in-kind services and facilities provided by the college.

AM&N already had a long established complete vocational arts program which offered training in automobile body repairing and painting, automobile mechanics, brick masonry, carpentry, cosmetology, electronics, appliance repair, practical nursing, secretarial training, tailoring, welding and machine shop.

In addition to this, the training program established basic education courses so that illiterates could be taught to read and write and those who already knew how to read and write could improve their skills in these areas.

Transportation—via school buses—was provided so that the new trainees could get back and forth from their homes to the college.

And a stipend—ranging from \$30 to \$50 a week—was established so that trainees could afford to attend school.

Then came the first recruiting drive. Recruiters contacted churches, newspapers, city and county officials and went from door-to-door in some instances to find persons who were willing to become trainees in the program.

According to Clinton Hampton, assistant director of the program, recruiters were not deluged with applications from potential trainees at first.

In fact, Richard A. Maxwell, the program counselor, estimated that the majority of the first trainees came into the program because of the stipend.

They enrolled in the program, Maxwell said, but this didn't mean they had any confidence in it. The general attitude of the new trainee was, according to Maxwell: "Well it sounds good, but I have to see it first."

"So," he continued, "it was up to us to really motivate them—to really change their outlook on life. And this is the thing that I feel we have accomplished more than anything else. We have instilled confidence in themselves and in us."

Maxwell noted that the 10-month training program that the trainees went through was "almost like a cram course."

"What they learn here," he said, "the average person gets in 2½ years. And they come out with flying colors."

Maxwell said he was shocked to discover so many people with native ability and intelligence "just doing nothing."

John Kuykendall, placement director for the program, said that learning new skills solved only a part of the trainees' employment problems.

More difficult, he said, is the psychological transition from farm work—"where you could go to work anytime you felt like it and lay off when you felt like it and nobody said a thing"—to industrial work where you have to be on time and schedules have to be met.

Kuykendall is responsible for the final phase of the program—getting the trainees jobs and seeing that they stay with them.

Most of the employers that Kuykendall contacted were skeptical at first, he said. But most decided eventually to give the trainees a try. And, by and large, they have been satisfied with them as employees, he said.

The trainees were skeptical at first, too, Kuykendall said. Most couldn't believe that they could get a job with a company that wouldn't consider employing them before they went back to school.

A familiar refrain, according to Kuykendall, was: "I've been here before. I know I

won't get a job here. They'll just send me to the employment office."

"So they were pretty impressed when 30 or 40 minutes later they had the job," he said.

"I have tried to explain," Kuykendall continued, "that companies are looking for trained people now. They aren't looking for people who just walk in off the street and say they can do this and do that without any experience or formal training."

Kuykendall spends a lot of time out in the field talking to potential employers and in keeping up with trainees who have already been placed on jobs, he said.

If he finds out that one of the former trainees has missed a day on the job, he contacts him to find out why. And he is always available to discuss any problems that might arise between employer and employee, he said.

Each trainee who has completed his training and gone on to productive employment is a success story.

Hampton, Kuykendall and Maxwell all have their favorite success stories.

During the routine testing done on all trainees during the 1967-68 training program, Maxwell discovered a 21-year-old woman who he felt definitely belonged in college.

That was Helen Williams of Tillar, who has just successfully completed her first year of college at AM&N.

Miss Williams had done farm labor—off and on—after her graduation from high school in 1965. And she was not too optimistic about the training program when she signed up for it.

"I expected to just end up with a certificate," she said in a recent interview.

She was surprised, she said, when Maxwell strongly urged her to enroll in college because she had never regarded herself particularly as college material.

But enroll in college she did—with the help of a National Student Defense loan, an economic opportunity grant and a summer job doing secretarial work—a skill learned in the training program.

This year Maxwell has recommended that two of the program's trainees go on to college next fall. They are Mrs. Mamie Charleston, 31, of McGehee, and Linda McKinney, 22, of Humnoke. Both just completed courses in secretarial training.

And both hope to attend AM&N next fall with the same sort of assistance that Miss Williams is getting.

Hampton's favorite story concerns a young man who had been a migrant agricultural worker—one who had never seen a brick laid in his life.

He spent four months in 1967 and 1968 in a class for brick masons. Then he was permitted to lay bricks on some faculty houses that were under construction.

According to Hampton, he quickly shaped up into a "cracker jack" brick mason. So he went to work for a private contractor. It didn't take him very long to notice that the contractor was making more money than he was. Hampton said, and so he soon went into business as a brick subcontractor.

Then he was drafted into the armed forces, Hampton said. But this did not end his brick-laying activities.

The last time the man was home on leave, Hampton said, he contracted for a job and then drafted four of this year's brick mason trainees to do some of the work.

As far as Hampton knows, the four new brick masons are still working.

Hampton, Kuykendall and Maxwell feel that the program has been a successful one during its two years of operation. But they are still not satisfied.

"You'd be surprised at the number of people who are still out there in these shacks," Kuykendall said.

August 4, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 6583

MORE PLEDGES

Despite all the troubles, Castro is making new promises of plenty for the Cuban people.

Recently he pledged anew that 10 million tons of sugar would be produced in 1970, and said this would solve Cuba's economic problems. On July 14, he helped get the sugar harvest under way. This is called the 1970 harvest because the traditional starting date of January has gradually been pushed up by six months. More eggs, rice were also promised.

American experts are certain these promises cannot be fulfilled—just as Castro has failed to fulfill his "better life" pledges of the last 10 years.

And they say, with things getting worse, that another year of unkept pledges could spell real political trouble for Castro by next summer.

Those watching developments believe that latent resistance in Cuba could become active, organized opposition in the not-too-distant future.

COMMISSION ON BALANCED
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution providing for the establishment of a Commission on Balanced Economic Development. This measure is a companion proposal to House Joint Resolution 168, introduced earlier in this Congress by Congressman PHILIP E. RUPPE of Michigan.

Congress daily is becoming more aware of the pressure which is being placed upon our earth resources by the expanding population of the United States. Illustrative of this concern is the series of hearings now being held by the Task Force on Earth Resources and Population of the Republican Research Committee, of which I am a member.

Unquestionably, the urbanization and suburbanization processes have created much strain upon our resources. It is not only appropriate but also very timely that we should undertake a comprehensive study of the means by which we might achieve a greater geographic balance in the ongoing economic development of the United States.

The Commission which we propose would be made up to 20 persons to be appointed by the President. Four of the members would come from cities of at least 1 million persons; four would come from cities having populations between 100,000 and a million; four would come from cities whose populations ranged between 10,000 and 100,000; four others would come from small towns and villages. No more than half of the persons from any one of these classes would be from the same political party. In addition to these members, four other persons would be appointed to the Commission without regard to political or geographic criteria, but upon the basis of their exceptional training, experience, and competence in the subject of the

investigation.

The Commission would be charged with submitting a report to the President and the Congress within 2 years after its establishment. It is our hope that the information gained through this study will enable the United States to achieve a better geographic balance in its economic development, which is expected to proceed at a rapid pace over the next 30 years.

During the remainder of this century America will be experiencing a profound shaping of its pattern of population distribution. Already, people are speaking of huge, identifiable urban belts such as San-San—San Francisco-San Diego—Chi-Pitts—Chicago-Pittsburgh—and Bos-Wash—Boston-Washington. I believe that America will be a healthier place to live, work, and raise a family if other viable alternatives also exist for our people. Indicative of the opposition to an America totally dominated by such megapolises is the current discussion of the potential development of new cities.

Perhaps the creation of new cities is part of the answer to our problem. Certainly, the strengthening of the economic life of many of our existing outlying communities is also vital. But clearly one of the important, indeed fundamental, objectives which we should endeavor to fulfill is the dispersion of our population in a manner which will enable us to efficiently utilize our earth resources in support of our human resources.

The formation of this study commission is one vital step toward the achievement of that element of a state of national health and well-being.

OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, early last month the Veterans of Foreign Wars held their 14-State Southern Conference in Norfolk, Va. Mr. Richard Homan, commander in chief of the VFW, made several splendid statements regarding our national security.

Believing as I do that his views deserve the attention of this House, I insert in the RECORD the comments of Mr. Homan as reported in the Norfolk Ledger-Star and Norfolk Virginian-Pilot:

VFW CHIEF'S VIEW: MILITARY-INDUSTRY COMPLEX PRAISED

NORFOLK.—The commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars brought to a close a weekend southern conference of the VFW with praise not only for the "military-industrial complex" but also the "military-educational complex."

Richard Homan told 800 delegates from 14 states that in praising the former he was not singling out any group, "for no such group exists."

"I am pointing to those on call 24 hours of each day around the globe, and to those in industry who are giving the best years of their natural life to build second-to-none defense forces," he said.

It was the builders of Polaris submarines and Minutemen missiles "who now believe they can build a Safeguard defense against missile attack and contribute still more to our security," he said.

"Both our military servants and our industrial leaders have been irresponsibly criticized for building weapons systems which have never been used," he said. "They have been criticized when the aim for building such weapons systems was to make them so awesome they would not be used."

As far as the "military-educational complex," was concerned, Homan said he could "think of no asset which contributes more to the national sinew."

In Tidewater, he said, tens of thousands of young men are taught specialized skills, self-discipline and the responsibility of citizenship.

"I say without hesitation that the military-educational complex represents one of America's valuable assets," he said. "The secondary benefits to our civic institutions and to our civilian economy are plain to see."

During the conference it was announced that Virginia was one of four Southern states to win "All-American" honors for its VFW posts' involvement with community programs and membership growths.

VFW HEAD SPEAKS OUT: HO'S MEDDLING IN
UNITED STATES HIT

NORFOLK.—The commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has accused Ho Chi Minh of "meddling and peddling" in this Nation's internal affairs.

At a press conference here Friday afternoon, Richard Homan said that the latest instance of this was his invitation to David Dellinger to represent the United States in the release of three prisoners of war now held in North Vietnam.

"Dellinger, at the time of Ho Chi Minh's cordial invitation, was under federal indictment stemming from the violent demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago," he said.

"Presumably, Ho Chi Minh wanted to practice his own expertise in U.S. domestic affairs."

Homan said that "the U.S. State Department has regrettably recommended that Dellinger be free to travel abroad and to represent America's national interest in this matter."

Homan, in Norfolk to attend a 14-state southern conference of the VFW, also took a swing at South Dakota Sen. George McGovern who recently announced that he had held private discussion in Paris with the North Vietnamese.

"Senator McGovern was not elected to the U.S. Senate for that purpose," he said. "He does not share with the President of the United States the responsibility of dealing with hostile nations. The role of the U.S. Senate is clearly defined by our Constitution. It is to advise and consent to treaties and commitments made by the President."

Homan said that the visit by eight Russian naval vessels to Cuba should be looked on as "the beginning of a new expansionist phase in Soviet naval and maritime diplomacy and influence."

He said that the Russian Navy had progressed from "the basics" of a proponently undersea Navy to guided missile cruisers and might well be expected to continue into the field of attack aircraft carriers.

The VFW conference here is expected to draw between 500 and 600 members. A banquet and dance is planned for tonight.

NO RECIPROCATON: VFW LEADER CRITICAL OF
TROOP WITHDRAWAL

NORFOLK.—The national leader of the Veterans of Foreign Wars said Friday that the United States should not have withdrawn any troops from Vietnam without reciprocal

E 6584

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

August 4, 1969

action on the part of the North Vietnamese. Richard Homan, commander-in-chief of the VFW, said the United States has been limiting its operations in Vietnam, hoping the North Vietnamese would also limit their operations.

Homan cited the bombing pause in the spring of 1968 and the withdrawal of troops as examples of this country's operational cut-back.

Homan, here for the 14-state Southern conference of the VFW which began Friday at the Golden Triangle, charged that idealists in the United States have supported the limitations on operations in Southeast Asia and thus assisted the North Vietnamese.

Homan referred to recent private contacts with the North Vietnamese negotiators in Paris. Homan charged that Sen. George S. McGovern, D-S.D. should not have undertaken a private mission to Paris for discussion with hostile agents.

"McGovern was not elected to the U.S. Senate for that purpose. The role of the U.S. Senate is clearly defined by our Constitution," said Homan.

Homan said that idealists of this type are dupes of the Communists because they undermine America's position.

"If the North Vietnamese don't begin to negotiate, we should review our operations and consider those alternatives available to us," he said.

Homan said the options to the United States include blockading the North Vietnamese ports, removal of bombing limitations, and increased military activity within South Vietnam.

"The people of this country don't want to put up with political generals. The day-to-day operations in military areas should be left to the Pentagon.

"When we contribute to this, we contribute to prolonging the war," he said, referring to those who make private contacts with the North Vietnamese.

"These political generals have assumed responsibilities outside their elected authority," said the 46-year-old commander.

"As soon as limitations are placed on us, the North Vietnamese tell their people they are winning," said Homan, "and the people believe them."

Homan said the United States should remain in Southeast Asia to prevent the entire area from going Communist.

Why there should be any question about it is one of the irrationalities of politics. George Murphy has proved to be an energetic Senator, a highly capable one, and a compassionate lawmaker. On his record, he should be unbeatable, so some of the questions raised as to whether he will again be a candidate may spring from wishful thinking among those who might have a chance if only Sen. Murphy would be obliging enough to call it quits.

A successful operation to remove a throat cancer left him with a voice that is soft, or as the Senator puts it, "I can't shout as loud as I used to."

But when Mr. Murphy talks, his colleagues listen, and what he says makes sense. That, it seems to The Press Democrat, is a decided asset to California in a legislative chamber so endowed with members who are long on oratory and short on reason that it has for decades been known as "the cave of the winds."

A CEILING ON FEDERAL SPENDING

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the virtue of consistency has been sorely missing in the House of Representatives in the last few days and I fear we are creating some very difficult problems for ourselves and for the country.

Ten days ago the President signed into law a bill in which the Congress included a ceiling on Federal spending in the current fiscal year. That ceiling was set at \$191.9 billion—\$1 billion below the total recommended by the President in April.

During the last 3 days the House has voted to increase spending for the programs of the Labor Department and the Health, Education, and Welfare Department by \$1.1 billion over the amount recommended by the President and \$922,563,000 more than recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

It is appropriate and timely today to examine the implications of this action in the light of the budget limitation.

The budget ceiling that Congress has imposed is flexible in two respects. First, we exempted increases of up to \$2 billion above the April budget in certain programs for which spending is unpredictable. Second, we provided that the ceiling will be adjusted by the net increase or decrease voted by the Congress in the April budget estimates of the President.

Events since April make it virtually certain that outlays for interest and other hard to predict programs will be higher than was estimated in April, perhaps by the full \$2 billion, thereby raising the statutory ceiling to \$193.9 billion.

President Nixon, in his July 22 statement, made a strong commitment on the part of his administration to live within a ceiling of \$192.9 billion. His message said, in part:

I know the Congress shares my determination to make the budget an effective instrument against the inflation that has wrought so much damage to the income and savings of millions of Americans. If the Congress did not share that commitment it would not have imposed this spending ceiling. However,

this general expression of support for fiscal restraint must now be matched by specific acts of the Congress.

We should understand clearly what the President means. If the Congress increases one of the President's budget requests, whether it be in reclamation or hospital construction, agriculture, or education, then the President will act either to avoid use of those increases or to cut other budget items an equal amount. If we refuse to be responsible—if we refuse to make this choice—then the President will make it. And some of us may not like the results.

In his statement, the President said he would prefer that the Congress make these cuts. So would I. I had hoped that most of the House also would so prefer. If we wish to hold down spending, we must demonstrate this desire not only in voting for an overall spending ceiling but also in each specific budget action that comes before us.

No one can say that the House demonstrated that desire during the past 3 days. Instead, we demonstrated that while it is easy to vote for a general, overall reduction in spending, it is much more difficult to resist voting for increases in the face of blandishments from the supporters of individual programs.

We now have a heavy responsibility to find the means of reducing other appropriation items to compensate for the billion dollar increase in education.

This we must do if we are to demonstrate that we truly agree with the President's view that inflation must be restrained. We said we did when we voted for the ceiling as a major weapon against inflation. I hope we meant it.

We have a clear duty to apply restraint in our future appropriations activities. I hope the Appropriations Committee recognizes that obligation and will do its utmost. The general welfare requires that we have the support of the House. The extra billion voted for education will buy very little if we allow inflation to run rampant in our Nation.

SENATOR GEORGE MURPHY MAKES SENSE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, a much deserved tribute was recently paid to the distinguished senior Senator from California, my good friend and colleague, GEORGE MURPHY, by the editor of the Santa Rosa, Calif., Press Democrat.

Because of his distinguished service in the U.S. Senate and his valuable service to the people of the State of California, I am taking the privilege of including this tribute to a great human being and an outstanding legislator in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SENATOR MURPHY

Doing part of his homework in Sacramento the other day, U.S. Sen. George Murphy was asked for the umpteenth time if he was going to run for re-election next year. And for the umpteenth time, he said he most definitely was.

STAND UP FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address entitled "Stand Up for Academic Freedom." This address was presented to the La Jolla Kiwanis Club of La Jolla, Calif., by Assemblyman John Stull who represents that portion of San Diego County in my congressional district. It is an outstanding address by one of the most outstanding legislators in the United States. I hope it will receive wide circulation. The address follows:

STAND UP FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Sweeping up and down our broad land is a growing sense of dismay and unease. We are aware of this in every facet of our lives,

May 23, 1969

Approved For Release 2003/03/25 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000300050001-9
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5519

other taxpayers, are carrying the tax load that these corporate giants are evading through their depletion allowance.

Major oil corporations don't vote. They don't pay their fair share of taxes. But they do try to buy influence, to pose as social benefactors who must be sheltered for the national good; and they use the tax benefits taken from our gullible society to get a stranglehold on every facet of the oil industry, to destroy their independent competition and to branch out into other businesses. Among their widening interests are: real estate, banking, grocery stores, trucking, airframe and space technology, plastics, paint and chemicals.

We feel that the major oil companies should be allowed to sell gasoline only at a definite, established wholesale price free from rebates, competitive allowances and all other devices used by them to lower retail markets in local areas and thereby destroy their independent competition.

We believe the oil depletion allowance should be carefully scrutinized by Congress, and either abolished entirely or else regulated so that it can only be used against actual drilling costs. Further, we believe that all oil companies receiving a depletion allowance should be divested of all their holdings that do not relate to oil production, refining or marketing, including real estate.

We small businessmen vote, the American taxpayers vote; we work for our candidates and on election day each of us is more important than the largest oil corporation.

We ask you for the protection of our government from destruction by these corporate monsters; we must have it now or we will surely perish.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. BEEBE.

S. E. RONDON Co.,
Pasadena, Calif., May 19, 1969.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention of Mr. Martin Lobel.)

DEAR SIR: Upon the suggestion of Mr. Martin Lobel, in which I had a long distance phone conversation May 19, 1969 12 noon Pacific Daylight time, I am writing my complaint on unfair competitive advantage of the major oil companies in the retailing of gasoline.

The S. E. Rondon Company has been a gasoline jobber and distributor for 24 years in Southern California.

The major oil companies increased the price of crude oil 20¢ per bbl. and as a result increased wholesale prices $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent to 1¢ per gallon. This was their justification. This increase in price gives the majors another increase of tax advantage, as a result, of 5½¢ per bbl. on the depletion allowance.

All majors in most cases have enough crude oil to supply their own needs up to 90%. In effect they increased the crude oil price which they are buying from themselves.

In Southern California retail prices of gasoline in major stations have dropped from a normal 34.9 to a low of 24.9. Resulting in elimination of competition by financial squeeze. This competitive advantage by the major is due and only due to 27½% depletion allowance which is used to support their drop in retail price of gasoline.

By using the depletion allowance they take specific areas to destroy independent competition of small business men who do not have this tax advantage. After competition is destroyed they raise the retail price and move to another area. Small independent business men pay a fair share of the tax and vote. Oil corporations pay little tax and don't vote.

I sincerely hope you can prevail to restore competition on an equal basis then the tax

paying public would not be footing the bill of the major in these costly retail price wars.
Sincerely yours,

S. E. RONDON.

P.S. I'll gladly fly to Washington to further relate my problem as a small business man or pay your expenses to come to Southern California for a personal observation.

U.S. RELATIONS WITH CUBA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on March 30, Mr. John Plank wrote for the New York Times Magazine an article entitled "We Should Start Talking With Castro." In effect, the article urged us to turn over Guantanamo Naval Base to Castro; to reopen trade and diplomatic relations; and to treat that Government as though it were normal; instead of as being repressive, repulsive, retrogressive, and exporting revolution as it seems to most of us with sound vision.

On May 11, 1969, Mr. Paul Bethel's letter to the editor replying to Mr. Plank was printed in the New York Times. It is, as usual, effective, knowledgeable, readable, and backed by facts instead of the wishful thinking of Mr. Plank. Mr. Bethel is an expert not only on Cuba, but on Castro's revolutionary activities throughout Central and South America.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine,
May 11, 1969]

LETTERS: A POLICY FOR CUBA

To the Editor:

John Plank in "We Should Start Talking With Castro," March 30, asserts that there is "one school of thought in the hemisphere that, unhappy with current policy, would turn—instead of toward accommodation with Castro's regime—toward increased pressure, military or other, against it. Paul Bethel, who with Spruille Braden and others, speaks for the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, reflects this viewpoint. . . . So, may we add, does President Nixon.

In his public utterances made during last fall's campaign, Mr. Nixon had this to say about Cuba: "It has become the center for external aggression and the export of revolution to the Western Hemisphere. . . . Therefore, U.S. foreign policy requires—and foreign policies of all other nations of the world require—that this kind of government be quarantined; quarantined for the sake of peace." Moreover, Mr. Nixon said: "New leadership is pledged to do better."

Mr. Plank also implies that it is only through groups such as the U.S. Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba that, in his words, "one gets a steady stream of alarmist reports: of Cuban caves chockablock with missiles, of secret Soviet submarine bases along Cuban coasts. . . ." Then he states: "Such thinking is certainly unhelpful and could be dangerous." Unhelpful to whom? Dangerous to what? These are strong accusations.

Here is what Hanson Baldwin, recently retired military editor of The New York Times, had to say on the subject of missiles: "Caves on the island are known to be packed with military equipment of various sorts, and if missiles are not included in these below-ground inventories today, it is perfectly possible that they may be tomorrow." On submarines, Mr. Baldwin states that the "likely utilization of a Communist Cuba by Russia is as a naval and submarine base or refueling and replenishing station."

Mr. Plank, in saying that the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo ought to be turned over to Castro, overlooks Mr. Baldwin's warning. It is only the incredibly naive who can believe that by handing the base to Cuba we would not, in fact, be turning it over to the Soviet Navy—and Bayles Manning, dean of the law school at Stanford University, Henry Wriston and many others hit hard at the thought of relinquishing control. In the face of this formidable array of expertise, Mr. Plank flatly asserts: "It is legitimate to ask who would be more disturbed, the United States Navy or Fidel Castro, if we were to decide to turn the base back to Cuba. A persuasive case can be made that our presence at Guantanamo is more useful to Fidel than to us." If such a case can be made, Mr. Plank has failed to present it.

As for the indirect threat to the hemisphere and the United States itself, Mr. Plank states that we should not "exaggerate" Castro's capacity to export wars and subversion. He also finds Soviet diplomatic and economic penetration of Latin America to be a wholesome development. As to the latter point, there is abundant evidence that the Soviet Union is using its trade missions and diplomatic establishments to advance Communist penetration, as well as to help Castroite guerrilla wars.

It should therefore be a matter of concern, not of subdued elation by Mr. Plank, who notes a "growing number of serious voices . . . calling for a fundamental reassessment" of the isolation of the Castro regime. It is not difficult to imagine, since the missile crisis resulted in the lodgment of Soviet power in the Caribbean, that Mr. Plank's "serious voices" actually are frightened voices, escalating in their determination to maintain their free domain inviolate.

Another point regarding the Russian-Cuban combination is this. Castro's allegiance to Moscow is strong, perhaps irreversible. Knowing this, Mr. Plank solves the problem by simply inviting the Russians to take a seat in hemispheric affairs, advancing the obvious fiction that they are merely "regularizing" their diplomatic and trade relations and no longer are acting like Communists. The Kremlin knows that its office is to wait upon events and policies such as those advanced by Mr. Plank to gain recognition of its position in Cuba.

Should the United States accommodate the Castro regime, it would result in an intolerable bipolarization of power in Latin America. The left would see in it a license to seize power; the traditional right would move to prevent it; weak political institutions in the middle would be overwhelmed. Capital investments would simply disappear, along with the Alliance for Progress.

From the Marxist-Leninist point of view, the Cuban "revolution" can be considered successful only to the extent that it envelops Latin America and isolates the United States. Only by submitting ourselves abjectly to Castro's wishes (actually proposed in detail by Mr. Plank) would even a frail coexistence be possible. It would break whenever we refused to do so. This was true in 1959; it is even more true in 1969.

I have not taken the time to challenge Mr. Plank's assertion that Castro enjoys "vast popular support," simply because Mr. Plank saved me the trouble by writing, "he has exported or imprisoned most of his potential and actual effective opposition," quite obviously the mark of an unpopular and oppressive regime.

A policy of rapprochement at this time could have no effect other than to rescue Fidel Castro from the wrath of his own people and advance him along the road of conquest.

I might add that the quotes of Hanson Baldwin and the positions cited by Bayles Manning and Henry Wriston appeared in a book of essays published in 1967 by the

S 5520

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 23, 1969

Brookings Institution, "Cuba and U.S. Policy." The editor, curiously enough, was John Plank.

PAUL D. BETHEL,
Executive Director, Citizens Committee
for a Free Cuba, Inc., Washington.

FOURTH INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE—A MAJOR SUCCESS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, Salt Lake City recently was host to the Fourth Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance. All Utahans joined me in the anticipation that the Partners Conference, May 10-14, would be a productive and successful meeting of peoples representing the private sector in North, Central, and South America. I am pleased to report to the Senate today that the conference was a major success.

From the reports that I have seen following the conclusion of the conference in Salt Lake City, I am convinced the working sessions in which more than 300 U.S. and Latin American delegates, representing 37 U.S. States in partnership with 37 areas in 16 Latin American countries, reflected a determination on the part of the delegates to develop specific action-oriented projects designed to make an impact on the fields of agriculture, education, public health, and business and industry.

Many favorable reports have also reached me regarding the outstanding leadership displayed by the cochairman of the Fourth Inter-American Partners Conference, Mr. Royden G. Derrick, president of Western Steel Co., of Salt Lake City; and Dr. Edgar Barboosa Ribas, outstanding physician of Curitiba, Brazil, who joined, in exemplary partnership fashion, to conduct an outstanding conference of citizens who are voluntarily giving of their time and talents collectively to attack the basic problems impeding the economic and social development of this hemisphere.

One of the highlights of the Partners Conference was an address by the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Hon. Charles Appleton Meyer, who addressed the banquet session on May 13, 1969. In his speech, Mr. Meyer praised individual and group initiatives in the field of foreign relations, stating that such initiatives are perhaps "the shortest description possible for the Partners of the Alliance." He added:

In fact, you and hopefully more like you, may be the great ingredient that, together with science and technology, enables Latin America to close the gap between what are called less-developed nations and developed nations.

At the beginning of his remarks, Mr. Meyer delivered a message from President Nixon who characterized the participants in the Partners of the Alliance program as "the vanguard of voluntarism in the Americas." I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's message to the delegates be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 12, 1969.

I want you to know the great importance that I attribute to your work. The Partners of the Alliance exemplify the best of the Hemisphere's joint efforts. Any working Alliance for Progress which has set challenging goals such as ours must be a partnership of people as well as nations. You have recognized this, and you are meaningfully advancing our common objectives.

Productive international cooperation must be between partners—partners who listen to each other, who share a cause, and pursue it with equal vigor. Your continuing success in furthering such cooperation is rewarding for all of us.

The creative potential of our societies can be fully realized only if individual citizens exercise initiative and are willing to reinforce the work of their governments. It is imperative that we realize this full potential if we are to deal effectively with our immense problems and achieve the kind of progress we seek.

As civic-minded individuals and groups, the Partners of the Alliance are in the vanguard of voluntarism in the Americas. You are using your talents and your time constructively for our benefit, and for that of all our Sister Republics.

I send you my warmest best wishes for sustained achievement.

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Secretary Charles A. Meyer be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES MEYER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Jim Boren, aided by two of my associates, Datus Proper and Hoyt Ware, labored mightily to write a speech for me to deliver to you tonight. It is a good one and it challenges you Partners with ideas. I don't know that you need challenges with ideas. You may be like the U.S. farmer who wrote to the Department of Agriculture and said: "Please don't send no more of your manuals on how to farm better. We ain't farming as well as we know how right now."

In honesty I should have been here all day Monday and Tuesday to learn more about your successes, your disappointments (if any) and your plans. Had I, I would not run the present risk of saying the unnecessary. Given my preferences, my wife and I would have sneaked out of Washington Friday, spent the weekend in our house at Vail, Colorado, and been here late Sunday night, 50% courtesy of Uncle Sam! Instead we looked for, found, and on Monday made a down payment on a house in Washington.

Six weeks ago today I was sworn in but not paid for; our house in Philadelphia was sold but not paid for; our house in Washington is found but not paid for. I am in the process of exchanging offices with Him Fowler, Deputy Assistant for AID, and redoing both. Not only am I committed by personal conviction but when Uncle Sam pays the bill for the revised office arrangement, he can't afford to hire me without at least a second thought.

So damas y caballeros—

Here we are on May 13th. Yesterday Governor Nelson Rockefeller began his series of four survey trips to each of the twenty-two nations represented by my bureau. President Nixon, in his address to the Pan American Union told us all that Governor

Rockefeller's report (or reports) would weigh heavily in this, the president's decisions re Policy for us.

As many of us present know, President Nixon has been interpreted as disenchanted with the Alliance.

I am learning the dangers of interpretive reporting. It seems that if the president were to say:

"Today is absolutely beautiful", he could be interpreted as follows:

"Nixon criticized yesterday and cast some serious doubts on tomorrow."

The fact remains that the administration has not leapt into the first 100 days with policies on everything—including us.

The fact is that I agree with this deliberate technique one hundred per cent.

Everything in my experience points to the fact that anything important and constructive involving millions of others that is done quickly is wasteful or worse.

The old saying, "Rome was not built in a day", is still valid. Brasilia may be an exception.

We are, in short, too important to be rushed into programs. Time is important too, but relative. One hundred days or two hundred days invested in deliberative analysis of the future of 450 million North, Central, Caribbean and South Americans—with as much as 400 years or countless centuries of past history on these continents and, God willing, a limitless future, seems to me a good investment.

There is, however, impatience in the air. Our U.S. press reflects this. Our U.S. Congress feels it. All of us have been so conditioned to motion, to a cult of "instantaneism", to a new model every year that we feel adrift without a pause (except for coca cola).

If this is true, it is not applicable to people-to-people relationships as exemplified by you, the Partners of the Alliance. Or it need not be. Flying West today (and it has been an absolutely beautiful day), it kept occurring to me that there would be little or perhaps nothing between Washington D.C. and San Francisco of the U.S. Government had had to plan it all. It kept occurring to me that Central and South America are a land area two and one half times the size of the U.S.A. and that our governments have been involved in developmental planning for this massive area with increasing intensity for about 20 years.

The extraordinary complexity of the development task loomed bigger and bigger and it occurred to me somewhere in Kansas that programs only accomplish what people accomplish. No organizational chart is worth a damn—only the people it represents, and people with a defined objective can do wonders with no organizational chart at all.

In short, I honestly believe it would have been impossible to build the U.S.A. with a master plan. The U.S.A. with its strengths and weaknesses is only the sum of all its parts, which parts are almost wholly the sum in turn, of individual and group initiatives, aided, abetted and regulated by government.

Individual and group initiatives—perhaps that is the shortest description possible for the Partners of the Alliance. In fact, you and hopefully more like you may be the great ingredient that, together with science and technology, enables Latin America to close the gap between what are called less-developed nations and developed nations.

It may be that you and more like you can plant or have planted the basic ingredient of motivation without which no individual can believe he or she can succeed.

Admittedly, in the human race, given equality at any grade on the scale from none of the advantages to all of the advantages, some humans just aren't motivated. I have just read of (and have asked one of my right arms to check more on Thursday) a social scientist from Harvard who has conducted

May 20, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 3871

Harvey Silbert, secretary of the Los Angeles based Foundation, said it sold its remaining 21,791 shares in the Parvin-Dohrmann Co. in early March. The firm owns three Las Vegas casinos.

Silbert said a mortgage on the Flamingo Hotel and gambling casino, from which the Foundation has derived income, also has been paid off within the last few months.

Douglas first came under criticism in Congress three years ago after the Los Angeles Times revealed he was being paid \$12,000 a year by the Foundation, which drew substantial income from the gambling industry.

This arrangement with the Parvin Foundation was recalled by newspapers and Congressmen during the recent controversy that forced another member of the high court—Abe Fortas—to resign last week.

Spokesmen for the Foundation had said all along that they knew of no appreciable change in the organization's assets. However, Silbert, in discussing the stock sales yesterday, said the Foundation's board—which includes Douglas as president—decided to dispose of its Parvin-Dohrmann stock "because we thought it was a good price at the time."

The Foundation sold its shares through a New York brokerage house for \$1,999,324, or more than four times the value assigned to the stock on its 1967 Internal Revenue Service return. The selling price was \$91.75 a share.

ANNIVERSARY OF CUBA'S INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANNA). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 65 years ago today, on May 20, 1904, a great moment came to pass in the history of the Cuban people:

The flag of the sovereign Republic of Cuba was unfurled in Havana, marking the success of one of the longest, most costly in human terms, and tragic struggles for liberty in the Americas.

On that memorable day, Spain's colonial empire in the Western Hemisphere reached its end.

And the history of the free Cuban Republic began.

Like the records of much of mankind's progress through time, that history has been filled with different, at times contradictory, passions and emotions—joy and tragedy, hope and despair, exhilaration and disillusionment.

Yet at all times, the history of the Cuban people has been characterized by a certain air, a certain style: It has been, above all, the history of a people who passionately love life and freedom, who delight in a song, beauty and excitement; who work hard and achieve much; but who also know how to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

Unfortunately, their moment of freedom was short. History, which has a habit of repeating itself, came the full circle. Tyranny once again reestablished its sway over the beautiful island of Cuba and its people.

In Fidel Castro, the Cuban people came to experience the embodiment of all the dictators, demagogues, petty ideologists and other assorted tyrants who have had their moment on the Latin American political scene—and then, in the words of William Shakespeare, "were heard of no more."

Propped up and supported by his shadowy masters in the Kremlin, thinly disguised in the garb of a self-proclaimed "liberator," Castro has occupied the center of the stage in Cuba for nearly a decade—talking, haranguing, oppressing, squelching the people's initiative, stamping out freedom.

In many respects, therefore, this is a sad day—because Cuba's present condition is tragic.

But it is also a day to honor and celebrate—for the cause of freedom continues alive, dwelling in the heart of every true Cuban, be it in Havana, Miami, Fla., or in some distant part of the world.

We must recognize this fact as we commemorate the anniversary of Cuba's independence.

And because of that factor, the day will come when the political and spiritual heirs of such great Cuban patriots as Maximo Gomez, Antonio Maceo, and Jose Marti will once again feel at home in Havana and in every hamlet and town across the length and the breadth of the island of Cuba.

Thousands of Cubans, in and out of Cuba, are longing and working for that day. Here in Washington today are Jose R. Julia, president of the Cuban Crusade for Relief and Rehabilitation and other representatives who join in this commemoration and pledge undying zeal for the restoration of liberty to Cuba.

To those of us who share their love of freedom and liberty, the course before us is clear:

We must continue to do all in our power to hasten the day when the legitimate aspirations of the Cuban people—for freedom, justice, and a better life—will be realized.

The United States of America has supported that goal. I am confident that under the new administration of President Richard Nixon we will continue to work with freedom-loving Cubans, and all the sons of liberty in our hemisphere, for the achievement of the goal of Cuban liberation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to read the following communication from Joseph R. Julia, president of the Cuban Crusade:

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, 1969—CRUSADE 1969-70 MESSAGE HONORING PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S MEMORY

His Excellency, President Richard M. Nixon and administration, Hon. Speaker John McCormack, Congressman Dante B. Fascell, and Members of the House and Senate.

May 20th Anniversary of the liberation of Cuba, gained through the payment of American and Cuban blood, split purchasing freedom and liberty to live as free men under God is the very symbol of American hemispheric brotherhood. For the first time in United States history, its citizens volunteered offering their lives to defend the birthright of every north or south American, it being, life, spiritual and material, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness unhampered by any colonial system of oppression.

Today, more than ever, Americans and Latin-Americans have an urgent call to heed, the distant cry of the Spanish-War American and Cuban dead to remember the first victory won by Hemispheric brethren fighting as one to win freedom for all. May 20th, Cuban-American or Latin-American Sol-

idarity Day is the Anniversary of the very first day of Hemispheric Brotherhood.

We honor today, the late Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, leader of the American Rough Riders, who aided their Cuban brothers win their liberty and who once stated, "Speak softly, but a big stick". This message should be remembered and heeded by all of our hemispheric peoples, especially Americans on this date. We should extend charity to all wherever possible, but always be prepared to defend yourself and way of life at all times against aggressors.

JOSEPH R. JULIA,

President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, May 20, 1969.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, to the Cuban people freedom and independence came the hard way, and after suffering under the oppressive Spanish colonial government more more than 400 years. Even after they had attained full freedom in 1902 by the withdrawal of the U.S. military authorities and the establishment of the Cuban Republic, the people of Cuba did not enjoy their freedom in peace, because political disturbances and the resulting rise of dictatorial regimes made a mockery of freedom.

This large island with an area of 44,000 square miles, rich in natural resources and fertile soil, was part of the overseas Spanish empire from its discovery by Columbus in 1492 until 1898. During that time the Cuban people worked hard and were exploited by their overlords. At times they rebelled against their rulers, but were not successful in their fight until they were aided by the intervention of the United States in 1898. When the short Spanish-American War ended by the Treaty of Paris in December 1898, Spain agreed to relinquish Cuba to the United States "in trust for its inhabitants." From January of 1899 until May 1902 Cuba was governed by U.S. military rule, though most of the offices were filled by Cubans. After this brief period of tutelage and training, on May 20, 1902, the U.S. authorities granted full and unconditional freedom to the Cubans. That day marked the Cuban Independence Day and became a memorable date in its history.

After that historic event Cubans became masters of their national destiny, and their government became a member of the community of free and sovereign states. They made good use of the riches of their island homeland and lived in prosperity. But they have not always lived in peace. Political disturbances have been frequent there, and often these have given rise to dictatorial regimes. And the freedom for which the Cuban people fought and which eventually they won, became a casualty under such regimes. That was true for certain periods before the last war, and has been true since the end of that war, especially since the establishment of Fidel Castro's Communist regime in 1959.

In today's Cuba Castro's dictatorial regime is the master of Cuba's destiny, but some 8,000,000 Cubans do not enjoy the freedom which is their inalienable right. Today they are almost as cruelly treated and exploited by Castro's tyrannical government as were their ancestors by the colonial rulers of Spain. They are prisoners in their island homes, and at present they are unable to better their political

May 20, 1969

lot. But on the observance of Cuban Independence Day, let us all hope that soon a way will be found to free these unfortunate Cubans from Fidel Castro's tyranny.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is sad and tragic that Cuban people in exile are forced to observe the 67th anniversary of Cuban Independence Day today removed from the native land they love and cherish. I am reminded of the verses:

Yo soy un hombre sincero
de donde crece la palma,
y antes de morirme quiero
echar mis versos del alma.

Cultivo una rosa blanca
en julio como en enero,
para el amigo sincero
que me da su mano franca.

Y para el cruel, que me arranca
el corazón con que vivo,
cardo ni ortiga cultivo;
cultivo la rosa blanca.

The Cuban patriot understands well the meaning and longing of these verses for its author, Jose Marti, was as revered in Cuba's struggle for independence as was George Washington in this country.

Marti, called the Apostle of Cuban Independence, still commands the widespread devotion of the Cuban people, who consider him the greatest hero of their independence movement.

The Cuban Revolution of 1895 began with the Grito de Balce—a town near Santiago in eastern Cuba—on February 24. Maceo from the Dominican Republic, and Marti and Gomez from the United States, set sail for Cuba with recruits gathered in the United States, Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean Islands. Gomez and Marti landed on the Cuban coast on April 11, 1895, and began a march to Santiago to unite the revolutionists. On May 19, en route to Santiago, the group was attacked by a Spanish patrol, and Marti was killed in the skirmish. Of Marti's death, a Cuban historian wrote, "Jose Marti died, but a people was born." The loss of the beloved leader fused the people of Cuba into an adamant struggle for their freedom. The revolution had been his creation, and he remained the first among many martyrs and heroes of revolutionary Cuba.

It is regrettable that there is today the need for further struggle and a call for more heroes to challenge the Communist dictatorship that has been entrenched for a full 10 years just off our southern shores.

We, as Americans, must pledge and dedicate ourselves to the task of working with the Cuban patriots in exile to achieve the liberation of our island neighbor.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, 67 years ago today a new feeling of hope and encouragement spread through Cuba as that nation convened its first all-Cuban congress and proclaimed itself a republic.

Today that feeling of encouragement is gone, but for many there remains hope that they will overcome the yoke of Communist domination which suppresses their individualism.

As we rejoiced in their success 67 years

ago, so we join in the sorrow today that they are unable to express that freedom for which they fought so long.

But we must marvel at the strength and determination of the majority of the Cuban population who continue to strive to return liberty to their nation.

There have been many, who, fearing death because they disagree with the present government, have fled to the United States.

Twice a year in Birmingham, on Law Day and Thanksgiving, naturalization ceremonies are conducted in the United States District Court. In nearly all of these sessions, former Cuban citizens disavow their homelands to embrace U.S. citizenship. The story behind these changes is evident in their expressions as they verbally renounce allegiance to their native lands.

For, many fled their homeland—a country which they dearly loved but one in which they could no longer live because of the suppression of freedom. Each has a story to tell of his happiness in at last finding liberty, but each also carries the sadness of friends and family left behind to live in oppression.

There are many thousands more, however, who remain in Cuba to take what action they can to restore the hope their nation held in 1902 as the first republic's flag was raised.

The Cuban Government, under Fidel Castro, cannot deny that its citizens are unhappy. Last year incidences of sabotage against the Castro regime rose to 28,000 according to official Cuban Government reports. And so far this year, the rate is known to be even higher.

Cuba's population is increasing at a tremendous rate and is expected to reach 8.35 million by next year and 18 million by the year 2000.

Although it is a rapidly growing country, it faces many economic problems—difficulties which have led to the rationing of almost everything from shoes to gasoline and cigarettes.

But Premier Castro has been quoted as saying:

With technology and science it is possible to produce enough so that a large population can receive everything it needs.

He made no mention of the freedom of expression and political belief that his countrymen need and for which they have so long striven.

Their struggle has been a continuous one. In recent years it has taken tantamount strength on the part of non-Communist Cubans to merely survive. But, the spirit of independence which the nation revelled in in 1902 persists in the hearts of many and urges them forward today to recapture their now lost liberty.

It is fitting today that we pay tribute to the thousands of Cubans who fought several bloody wars to overthrow the domination of a foreign nation. The parallels to today's Cubans are evident, but this time they seek to eradicate domination by an internal power.

And so, although Cuba obtained its independence 67 years ago, its people are still fighting today to maintain that freedom. With their continuous courage it

is my hope and belief that they will prevail.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleague from Florida, the Honorable DANTE B. FASCELL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, in commemorating Cuba's Independence Day.

Many of us, I am certain, greet this occasion with mixed emotions. While we rejoice with freedom-loving Cubans in honoring their country's long and successful struggle for liberty, we cannot ignore the tragic plight of their countrymen today.

What Maximo Gomez, Antonio Maceo, and Jose Marti fought for, what another generation of Cubans was able to wrestle from Spain, is no longer being enjoyed by the people of Cuba.

They are neither free, nor well-to-do, nor content with their present condition.

As much as Castro may try to deceive the world and the Cuban people themselves with his endless diatribes about the Communist paradise which he is attempting to fashion for Cuba, the facts of life in that country stand out for all to see.

Under Castro's regime, most of the people who possessed the skills and talents necessary to develop a nation have been decimated and driven from Cuba.

The average Cuban worker lives today in a condition of enforced labor and persistent want—rarely able to secure even ordinary articles of clothing and footwear for his family.

And the entire "socialist" experiment—and I use that word in quotes—survives on two key factors: the reign of terror instituted by Castro to do away with all political opposition; and the massive outpouring of Soviet dole which props up the faltering economy and enables it to stagger along.

We should not mistake these facts. No matter how much Castro may try to flaunt his "independence," he remains a stooge of the Kremlin, critically dependent on the Soviet Union for his very survival.

Similarly, his ruthless elimination of all opposition makes a lie of his claim to be the vanguard of a democratic, socially-oriented revolution in Cuba and elsewhere in Latin America.

All of us, I am certain, are aware of these facts.

We decry them—and we extend our profound sympathy to the people of Cuba who have been isolated from their brothers and friends in this hemisphere, and forced to suffer their present condition, by Castro's shenanigans.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of liberty which sustained the Cuban people during the bitter decades of the 19th century while they struggled to shed the Spanish colonial yoke, will again sustain them in their hour of trial.

I am certain that all Cubans, wherever they may be for the present, cherish the dream of one day living again in a free and independent Cuba, ruled by a government responsive to the aspirations of the Cuban people.

I know that we, in the United States, will continue to do all we can to help them realize that dream.

E1630

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

March 4, 1969

and the inhuman exploitation of the workers by the government (which controls all the jobs) reveals either a lack of knowledge of the real situation or a willful design to mislead the readers.

Before Castro all the workers had the 44 hour week with payment equivalent to 49 hours; enjoyed one full month vacation, with pay, for every 11 months of work; they were paid time and half for any work in excess of 44 hours a week, and could not be dismissed, except for the causes specified in the law, after a six-month trial period.

Today, under Castro, workers must work 12 hours a day in order to be paid the equivalent of 8 hours, and must devote most of the off days and holidays doing "voluntary work" (which means for free) for the government.

HERDED LIKE CATTLE

Castro's regime is relying more and more on "voluntary work." Whenever it is needed, the government literally herds hundreds and thousands of workers who are transported like cattle in trucks to where they are needed, and there they are subjected to an inhuman exploitation which is tantamount to slavery by any standard.

Public elementary education was free before Castro (including textbooks and free breakfasts). The tuition at public high schools was as low as \$12 per academic year and at the state universities (there were 5) the average was \$60 per year. In addition to that, 15 per cent of the total number of students enrolled was admitted entirely free of charge, and there was no distinction as to race, creed, economic or social standing or political sympathies. Today the students are indoctrinated rather than educated (one compulsory subject is hating the U.S.A.), and the minute anyone shows any lack of enthusiasm toward the regime, out he goes.

Electricity and local telephone service are not free. Electricity is rationed but must be paid for. What is free is the use of public telephones. But whoever uses them must be extremely cautious, because there is always a G2 agent eavesdropping.

FREE FUNERALS

—And as to funerals, well, that is the very least that Castro could give to the Cubans after underpaying them and over working them to death.

The other benefits—a banquet for wedding guests, tickets to sport events and the use of public bicycles (?)—are really so ridiculous that they do not deserve any further comment at this moment.

But this point is that even accepting those "benefits" as such, the showing of the Castro regime, after 10 years of absolute rule, at the cost of destroying the Cuban nation physically, politically, economically and socially, is a very poor one indeed.

On the other hand, the Cubans would gladly pay for all the things they could have before Castor (today everything is rationed), and are most willing to exchange the few free things that Castro has given them for all the rights and freedoms he has snatched from them, such as freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, freedom of movement, the right to FREE elections, and the most cherished of all freedoms, that of being a FREE nation, for one of the achievements of Castro-communism has been to transform Cuba into the first Soviet satellite in the Americas.

THE BOUNDARY LINE

Those freedoms—the lack of which the Castro panegyrists avoid mentioning—are precisely the boundary line between living as "slaves" under a dictatorship or as "human beings" in a democracy. And those are the freedoms that disappear the minute communism captures any place, for communism and freedom are incompatible.

But even assuming that Castro has brought some benefits to some part of the Cuban population, the fact is that he is a dictator. He has been 10 years in power. By election and reelections? No. The free elections he promised time and again during the struggle against Batista (and which were the main goal of said struggle) have never been held. He introduced communism in Cuba by sheer deceit and has remained in power by ruthlessly suppressing any form of opposition.

REJECTED BY MAJORITY

The majority of the Cuban people struggled against Presidents Machado and Batista the very minute they became dictators, and just because Castro is a dictator, he is rejected by the majority of the Cuban people. Why then do not those self-styled panegyrists instead of praising Castro on this tenth anniversary in power, tell him "Stop, Fidel, step out and let the Cuban people freely elect their own leaders and their form of government?"

And if conditions are so good in Cuba according to Castro's propaganda, why are the Cubans so desperate to leave the island, which is much easier to say than to comprehend? For Cuba had never been a land of emigrants but of immigrants, and never before, not even during the depression of the 1930s, or during the dictatorships of Machado and Batista, had there been such an appalling exodus.

Furthermore those who leave Cuba have not only to endure countless inconveniences and humiliations, but do so at the price of relinquishing everything they possess—I repeat, everything—to the Castro regime. And at this point I ask you: Would you be willing to leave your country under such circumstances? And perhaps you would say: "No, unless some unendurable situation compels me to do so."

FLIGHT CONTINUES

Yet, since Castro took over, more than 600,000 Cubans have abandoned the island; about 4,000 are leaving regularly every month by means of the Freedom Flights; over 1,300,000 have already applied for permission to leave the country, and an average of 100 leave each month through clandestine means, using anything that floats. And all that out of a population of 7.8 million people. Apparently 10 years of intensive propaganda have not been enough to convince the Cubans that they are living in a paradise:

And if the Castro-Communist regime has been so beneficial, why the need of the 2,400,000 members—out of a population of 7.8 million people—of the "Comites para la Defensa de la Revolucion," that is to say, "Committees for the Defense of the Revolution," charged mainly with spying on their neighbors?

KNOCKING AT DOOR

This country has always been ready, no matter the price, to help other countries preserve their freedom, in Europe, in Asia and other parts of the world.

But how about preserving your freedoms? Do not think that communism is still 90 miles away. It is knocking at your door. Do not be deaf to those knocks. Answer them by fighting Communism.

The place is here and the time now. Do not wait until the "Comites para la Defensa de las Revolucion" knock at your door! Fight now. Later it might be too late!

P.S.: At this writing I read in the newspapers the details of the most recent mass escape to freedom: That of 81 Cubans to the U.S. Naval base at Guantanamo.

Those who succeeded told stories of up to

100 persons who recently failed to make it over the six-foot high fence encircling the Base. But they keep fleeing. . . .

And Willis Jessie, who hijacked a plane last August and fled to Cuba with his three-year-old daughter, has returned to the U.S.A.! West Virginia Congressman Ken Hechler, who negotiated Jessie's release, said: "Jessie decided almost immediately upon arriving in Havana last August that he would rather risk prosecution as a plane hijacker than have his three-year-old daughter raised in a Communist land."

VIRGINIA RADIO STATIONS APPEAL TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as most Washington area residents are aware, radio stations WAVA-AM and WAVA-FM, in Arlington, Va., have for some years operated a special news format completely different than the programming of other area radio stations.

United States Transdynamics Corp., which owns the WAVA stations, took a long gamble in 1962 by converting to an all-news format over advice that no one would listen to continuous news. But not only the response in Washington but the subsequent decisions of stations in other cities to begin similar broadcasting is testimony of their success.

Now the Washington Post Co., which during the past few years has acquired the Washington Times-Herald newspaper, radio stations WTOP-AM and WTOP-FM, television station WTOP-TV, and Newsweek magazine, with economic power that can only strangle any competition, intends to move into the all-news programming field via its radio stations.

The owners of WAVA have protested to the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Speaker, against the intent of the Washington Post Co. to force this small news broadcaster into competition with a conglomerate broadcaster which will inevitably result in its failure. I have joined their protest, and I ask permission to insert a letter I have addressed to the Commission as well as an editorial broadcast recently by the President of WAVA, at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 12, 1969.

HON. PAUL RAND DIXON,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, I have long been mindful of the problems of small business, the preservation of which I consider vital to a free and competitive business society. Especially in this era of increasing economic concentration, its problems have been compounded, and the importance of the role of the Federal Trade Commission as an arbiter of commercial conduct has correspondingly increased.

In this connection, it has come to my attention that an application for a complaint

March 4, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 1629

of 5,000. That will mean the size of the city of Pryor will be at least doubled.

Mr. Speaker, this success story is the result of farsighted men in Oklahoma and Washington who had an idea and turned it into a success. Russell Hunt, of Tulsa, has worked tirelessly on this project since the time it was only an idea. He was named chairman of the Oklahoma Ordnance Works Authority when it was created, and still holds that post.

Mr. Redden has been with the authority since its creation, as has another member of the board of trustees, Burke Webb, of Oklahoma City. Robert H. Breeden, director of the Oklahoma Industrial Development and Parks Department, is a member of the board, and Philip H. Viles, of Claremore, represents the Grand River Dam Authority on the board.

Mr. Speaker, we owe these gentlemen a salute for providing the initiative, effort, and energy to create this success story at Pryor. It is one of the finest examples of local, State and Federal cooperation, making constructive use of a Federal program, that I have seen anywhere.

CONFRONTING THE CUBAN ISSUE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the nonproliferation treaty a subject of current debate, a nuclear agreement between Havana and Moscow signed on January 8, 1969, should be given serious consideration. Ostensibly for oceanographic and meteorological research, Cuba's new endeavor is being aided by the Soviet Union which is supplying not only scientific material but also technicians. According to John F. Lewis, coordinating editor of the American Security Council's Washington Report, there are now a total of 231 top Russian scientists now serving in Cuba, with 222 more due to arrive at the end of this year. In addition, an estimated 300 scientific specialists in all fields of advanced research have settled in Cuba from the Communist satellites in Eastern Europe.

Cuba's aspirations in the nuclear field make it all the more imperative for us to consider what steps we should take regarding the increasing Cuban threat to our security. My good friend, Meldrim Thomson, reminded us of this urgent issue in an editorial in the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader of February 10. In addition to offering a number of recommendations, Mel directed our attention to an article on Cuba by Dr. Bernardo Figueredo, formerly office manager in Cuba's leading law firm of Lazo y Cubas and now residing here in the United States. We are fortunate in having knowledgeable sources such as Dr. Figueredo who will not let us forget that a very real danger faces this Nation not many miles off our Southern shores. No longer can we afford the luxury of letting the Cuban question drift unattended by an aimless and directionless foreign policy.

We can begin a positive program of coping with the Cuban threat by persuading our allies to joint in a trade quarantine of Cuba. It is indeed ironic that we have joined in military alliances with nations which in turn carry on trade with Cuba as usual. It seems to me that this is a sensible first step in eventually returning that beleaguered island to its rightful owners—the Cuban people.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the above-mentioned editorial by Meldrim Thomson, Jr., along with the article by Dr. Bernardo Figueredo entitled, "The Other Side of Cuba."

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 10, 1969]

A NIXON DOCTRINE URGENTLY NEEDED

When President Kennedy junked the Monroe Doctrine during the Cuban missile crisis, he deprived the Americas of a mighty international doctrine that had effectively guarded the New World for more than a century against the piratical intrusions of Old World nations.

Even worse, President Kennedy, because of what many believe to have been a secret agreement made with Khrushchev, at the time of the missile crisis, consigned millions of helpless Cubans to a living death of slavery under Castro by preventing Cuban Freedom Fighters from organizing in the United States.

From the missile crisis we have reaped a full blown conspiracy to frock Castro in the spurious robes of a benefactor of mankind while, in the admonitory words of Dr. Mario Lazo, great Cuban lawyer and tireless worker for Cuban freedom, he holds a dagger in the heart of America.

Evidence of a concerted effort to dupe Americans into believing that Castro is the essence of bearded benevolence in the pearl of the Antilles, is graphically told and its insidious propaganda eloquently refuted in the important article appearing today at the top of the back page by Dr. Bernardo Figueredo, formerly of Havana and now living in Oxford.

On December 28th Dr. Figueredo noted an article appearing in a New Hampshire paper entitled "A Full Decade of Castro" by Richard Spong, a professional columnist whose work is distributed by Editorial Research Associates of New York City. The identical article, excepting only the first two paragraphs, appeared on December 26th in the Wilkes-Barre Record (Pennsylvania) as an editorial.

Dr. Figueredo was office manager in Cuba's leading law firm of Lazo y Cubas before he was compelled to flee from Cuba with his wife and three children, leaving behind all of their worldly possessions.

He and his wife have started life anew in New Hampshire where they have applied for American citizenship. They know first hand, as few people in our state do, that there never can be any compromise with tyranny, no matter what guise it wears. As an intelligent and concerned student of the Cuban and American scenes, Dr. Figueredo has had the courage to speak frequently of the menace to us of a Communist Cuba.

In the presidential campaign of 1960 Richard M. Nixon had an opportunity to speak out against the Castro evil which by then was apparent to American leaders, but for political reasons best known to him he remained silent.

Now as President, Nixon has an opportunity to take positive action against the continuing and deepening menace of Castro.

One of his first official acts should be to repudiate all secret agreements with Russia that might have been made during the missile crisis. He should make it clear that our government will not in the future interfere with the activities of Freedom Fighters when

they in no way violate any laws of our country.

And, most important of all, President Nixon should announce his own protective doctrine for the Americas—a doctrine to supplant the discarded Monroe Doctrine.

He should tell the world that under no circumstances will the United States tolerate the existence of atom or hydrogen missile bases in any part of the New World.

Such a Nixon Doctrine would make it clear to all that the United States means to live in peace by eliminating the danger of having an atomic holocaust ignited in the New World.

DEADLY BENEFITS OF CASTRO GOVERNMENT: THE OTHER SIDE OF CUBA

(By Dr. Bernardo Figueredo)

In the Dec. 28, 1968 issue of a local newspaper I read an article by Mr. Richard Spong titled "A Full Decade of Castro," and a few days later I received a photo-copy of an editorial titled "Castro's Tenth Anniversary" taken from a newspaper of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., which circumstances would be of little significance were it not for the fact that excepting the two opening paragraphs of Mr. Spong's article, the rest of his article and the Wilkes-Barre editorial are exactly alike.

It seems that, in the best of the cases, somebody is copying someone, which would be a very ugly thing; or it could be a concerted propaganda in favor of Castro, which could be a very grave thing.

But—be it just a coincidence or a concerted effort—that is a fine example of the type of propaganda, based on half-truths and distorted facts, that is being carried throughout the United States (perhaps with the hope that in many places there is no one who knows, or who dares to expose, the other half of the truth) with the purpose of alienating the friendship and the trust of the American people in favor of Castro-communism in particular and communism in general. And that might be very dangerous, for a friendly and unsuspecting people is an easier prey than an alert people. Remember, Khrushchev's dictum "We will bury you" has not yet been written-off from communism's blueprint for world conquest!

I answered at length Mr. Spong's article and the local newspaper published my answer in its Jan. 3, 1969 edition—for which courtesy I am most grateful to it—and for that reason I am not going to reproduce my answer fully. However I want to comment on two or three of the supposed benefits that, according to Mr. Spong's article and the Wilkes-Barre editorial, the Castro regime has bestowed upon the Cuban people. But before doing that I feel it is my duty to correct one gross misstatement contained in those writings.

MORE MISSILES

There are in Cuba, today, more missiles than during the so-called 1962 Cuban missile crisis, with a striking capability that poses a real threat to large areas of this country (to the north as far as Washington, D.C.). Therefore, Castro's Communist Cuba, in its 10th anniversary, is not, as Mr. Spong and the Wilkes-Barre editorial say, a thorn in the flesh of the United States, but a veritable dagger dangerously aimed at the heart of this country.

And, by the way, the foregoing constitutes a flagrant breach of the "Kennedy-Khrushchev" agreement: You remove the missiles from Cuba and we will see that Castro is not molested.

And now let us examine some of the benefits, namely, "jobs for almost everybody throughout the year" and "free of charge, education at all levels (including textbooks) . . . electricity, local telephone service . . . and a funeral."

CASTRO'S JOBS

To say that in Castro's Cuba there are jobs for almost everybody without exposing the miserable compensation paid for those jobs

S 3560

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 2, 1969

cent occurred during the past 12 months. Of the 33,641 who have been killed in Vietnam, 38.2 percent met their death during the past year.

During the first 3 weeks of the last month—as recently as that—the United States had more men killed in Vietnam, and more men wounded in Vietnam, than in any 3-week period during the history of the war.

From the beginning, I have felt that U.S. involvement in a ground war in Asia was a great error of judgment. But since our Government decided to draft men and send them to Asia to fight, I feel we must give them full support.

That is why I want to emphasize and reemphasize the severe casualty figures in the hope that this will focus attention on the difficulties facing our troops in Vietnam.

NATIONAL GOALS AND THE MILITARY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, the Joint Economic Committee filed its report. I think it was a good report, one which has received substantial consideration by the press.

There is one segment of the report especially significant, which may easily be overlooked, because it was not emphasized in the releases, and because it is a long report and the segment appears back in the body of the report. I am referring to the defense-related recommendations in the committee's report which I think are the toughest in this field in the committee's entire 23-year history.

I rise today, Mr. President, to urge Congress to give special attention to those recommendations. The committee has called for a substantial increase in the critical scrutiny given the defense budget both within the executive branch and in Congress.

In our annual report, we urged the Council of Economic Advisers and the Bureau of the Budget increase substantially their efforts to analyze and evaluate issues related to defense spending. And we urged that the Executive Office of the President undertake ongoing and comprehensive investigations of defense procurement matters and submit their findings to the Joint Economic Committee as part of the annual economic report.

As our report states:

The Bureau of the Budget should strengthen its defense review capacity so that it can adequately scrutinize Defense Department budget requests. The Council of Economic Advisers should focus its attention on defense expenditures and their impact on the economy. Agencies such as the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce should begin studying the effects that defense spending is having on wages and prices. The annual economic reports to Congress should present the results of these analyses.

There is now substantial evidence that improved efficiency in defense spending could free much needed resources for reallocation to higher priority civilian programs.

In developing policy to resolve in a satisfactory way the collision of demands for investment in education, cities, labor

retraining, and the elimination of poverty as against the unquenchable desire of the military establishment for more weapons systems and more sophisticated armaments, it is necessary that the Federal Government establish a meaningful set of national priorities. To do this Congress must have an explicit set of priorities and objectives to guide it in shaping new legislation and making appropriations.

That means Congress must have improved information on the economic effects of both existing programs and new proposals. Data on both benefits and costs and the distribution of these among groups in our society is now being generated on an ongoing basis by the planning-programing-budgeting system. But so far the Congress has not obtained access to this information.

It is obvious that this data is essential to Congress for distinguishing productive expenditures from those of little worth when all agencies and interests claim that their programs and projects are essential to the Nation and of highest priority.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report on National Goals and Priorities be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART IV—NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND EFFECTIVE PUBLIC POLICY

NATIONAL GOALS AND PRIORITIES

The budget of the Federal Government accounts for over 20 percent of the Nation's total output of final goods and services. The allocation of this nearly \$200 billion budget among the multitude of Federal programs has an enormous influence on both the structure of outputs produced by the U.S. economy and the distribution of the Nation's income. Because of this impact of Federal revenues and expenditures on the society, it is essential that allocation decisions be based on a clear statement of national goal and priorities. This necessity is reinforced by the rapid growth in Federal expenditures over the past several years.

We urge that the Congress, with guidance from its leadership, and the administration undertake a formal and comprehensive study of national goals and priorities with a view to establishing guidelines for legislation and expenditure policy.

We recognize the serious difficulties which plague efforts to seek general agreement on these basic questions of national direction. Indeed, the vitality of this Nation's political system stems from the diversity of opinions and values held by the populace. We have, however, recently witnessed a period of intensive study of a large number of issues which pertain to national goals. While many of these issues were related, the task forces which were responsible for the analysis and recommendations properly viewed their mandate as being limited in scope. It is now time to seek a broader perspective: an overview in which the urgency of the individual demands generated by these reports can be subjected to a comprehensive appraisal. We believe that the following considerations are basic to any serious discussion of national priorities.

1. The study of goals and priorities should determine the dollar costs required to attain each of the substantial number of objectives which are often cited as being primary social goals. It is important that public decisionmakers have before them an esti-

mate of the costs of each item in the array of social objectives, all of which would be chosen if they could be afforded. This information, by demonstrating that the devotion of resources to one objective implies a foregone opportunity to support another, leads to improved public decisions by clarifying the real costs associated with any decision.

2. The study of goals and priorities should evaluate the output and financial resources which the economy and the Federal Government can call upon in attaining social objectives. It is now possible to project with some accuracy the future output of the economy and, given the existing tax structure, the budgetary resources which will become available to the Federal Government. Moreover, it is possible to estimate confidently the future expenditures in a substantial number of Federal governmental programs which, for all intents and purposes, are beyond the annual control of the appropriations process. By ascertaining the difference between these two flows—projected revenue increases and increases in unavoidable Federal outlays—we obtain what is sometimes called the fiscal dividend. This figure provides both the Congress and the executive branch with meaningful information on the future availability of resources which can be allocated among the various social objectives. Such estimates should be developed for a range of plausible assumptions and should be updated and published on an ongoing basis. This information, it should be noted, is the complement of the data on the total costs required for attainment of each of the objectives.

3. The study of goals and priorities should focus on the allocation of Federal revenues between the military and civilian budgets. Because the defense budget is substantially less visible than budgets for civilian programs and because of our past experience with national security costs which have substantially exceeded initial estimates, this allocation question should not be neglected in an analysis of national priorities. Information concerning the budgetary implications of a number of possible national security postures is essential to meaningful public policy decisions and a rational allocation of the Federal budget among its competing claims.

THE ECONOMIC APPRAISAL OF PUBLIC PROGRAMS

Quantitative information of the economic effects of the expenditures which we are now making is as essential to an effective and efficient government as a clear sense of priorities and objectives for future action. Because of the rapid rise in Federal expenditures in the last decade, the experimental nature of newly legislated social programs, and the current period of budget stringency, implementation of procedures for the accurate economic analysis of spending programs is most urgent. It is also essential that information on program effectiveness now possessed by the administration be transmitted to the Congress.

This committee welcomed President Johnson's Executive Order issued in August of 1965, establishing the Planning-Programing-Budgeting System. In our judgment, the PPB System provides a meaningful framework for improved policy analysis and program evaluation. From information presented to the committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government, we judge that a substantial amount of valuable economic analysis and information has been generated by the operation of the system in the executive branch. Many expenditure programs can now be evaluated by decisionmakers in terms of the relationship between social benefits and social costs. Moreover, the social characteristics (race, income level, age) of the people who receive the benefits of Government programs are now known by decisionmakers in the administration in substantial detail. As President Johnson stated in his

the lot of the average peasant is better than ever.

Said *Newsweek*: "While the quality of life in Cuban towns has plummeted in the past 10 years, the lot of the campesino in the Cuban countryside has unquestionably improved. If nothing else, the country's small farmers and cane cutters are healthier today than ever before."

Echoed the *New York Times Magazine*: "Outside Havana everyone eats better and the students and farm workers are well fed."

The fact of the matter is that this is simply not so.

Writing in the Jan. 6, 1969, issue of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's periodical "Foreign Agriculture," food expert Wilbur F. Buck says: "When the Castro regime came to power in 1959 the Cubans were one of the best-fed peoples in Latin America. Extensive and indiscriminate livestock slaughter in 1959 and early 1960, however, caused a sharp drop in meat supplies. A decline in the output of food crops, especially rice, during Castro's early years in office was precipitated by rapid nationalization of farm properties and the shift in direction of trade."

"The past decade has witnessed a deterioration in the average Cuban's diet, particularly in its quality, as grain protein has replaced much of the animal protein."

"Food production in 1968 is estimated to have been about 10 percent less than the 1957-59 average. But food production per capita has declined some 25 to 30 per cent from that of a decade earlier, necessitating heavy imports of food products, such as wheat and wheat flour from Canada on Soviet account."

Castro's troubles at home, however, are not solely economic. For quite some time there have been indications of social and domestic discontent in Cuba. Castro himself confirmed these rumors in a speech last year marking the eighth anniversary of the establishment of his committee for the Defense of the Revolution. In this talk he spoke of a wave of sabotage and of the rising rate of prostitution among girls in the 14 and 15-year-old age bracket.

He spoke of the opposition of many Cuban university students to his policies, specifically his backing of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia. He cited their destruction of photographs of Che Guevara and their burning of the Cuban flag.

And although the Cuban government officially announced only four acts of sabotage during the six-month period prior to Castro's speech, Castro himself admitted in this speech that there had been more than 70.

It is true that under Castro, illiteracy has been reduced. But what good will it do for one to learn how to read, then die of starvation or malnutrition?

This point was made most succinctly on a radio show in the Dominican Republic. "You Be the Jury," in which a Cuban exile asked about life under Castro replied: "Under Fidel's regime, despite what he says about the peasants, it is not so. Things are not the same as he tells the peasants. There is no clothing, no shoes, no nutrition, no entertainment. Then what does it matter if the literacy rate is increased? There is no freedom, no money to spend and nothing to read but Communist propaganda."

OTTO OTEPKA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that a major newspaper is in the process of writing a lengthy article or articles on the nomination of Otto Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board. According to reports which have reached me from many sections of the country, it is obvious that this newspaper is leaving no stone unturned in a fruitless endeavor

to find material which could be twisted somehow so as to reflect adversely upon Mr. Otepka's character and judgment. The scope of this effort, the length of time which the newspaper has allotted to it, and the number of reporters involved all suggest that this newspaper suddenly is attaching great importance to the Otepka case.

This same newspaper recently described the Otepka appointment editorially as "revolving," and said that his name "recalls immediately some of the worst abuses of the Joseph R. McCarthy era—particularly the reckless use of raw security files." This is a most remarkable statement from a supposedly responsible newspaper. Mr. Otepka was never in any sense an associate of the late Senator McCarthy, whatever one's opinion of that Senator's goals and methods. Furthermore, Mr. Otepka is the last person who might be charged with the reckless use of raw security files, since he was precisely the person in the State Department who was charged with the statutory responsibility of evaluating raw security files—which he did entirely within the closed confidentiality of the security system. Mr. Otepka has never at any time discussed security cases in public, nor did he ever testify or transmit information concerning specific cases to any unauthorized agency.

If anything, Mr. Otepka's name recalls another era and the problems associated with security in that period. Certainly no one would sanction calling our late colleague, Senator Robert Kennedy, a McCarthyite when, as is well known, he was a longtime associate and prominent staff member of the McCarthy investigating committee? Yet, how much more plausible it would be to refer to someone as an associate of Senator McCarthy who was actually an associate of Senator McCarthy, rather than someone like Mr. Otepka who never had any connection with Senator McCarthy in any respect whatsoever. There are some who define "McCarthyism" as "guilt by association," yet this newspaper finds Mr. Otepka guilty without any association whatsoever.

It is, therefore, disturbing when a newspaper that lacks common decency and truthfulness suddenly awakens to the need for "in depth" coverage of Mr. Otepka, and at the very moment when Mr. Otepka's actions have been vindicated by appointment to one of the highest security posts in the Government. This same newspaper never showed great interest when the substantive matters of the Otepka case were being played out in the drama before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. At that time, its coverage was perfunctory, or nonexistent, when matters of great concern to this Nation's security were being revealed. Instead of spending its money in transcontinental telephone calls and putting a crew of reporters to work, this newspaper would be better off examining the printed hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and making up for lost ground.

In these hearings, this newspaper would find much which should be of great concern to a newspaper which re-

fesses liberal attitudes. This newspaper would find there documented cases of wiretapping and eavesdropping, a practice which has been roundly condemned in its editorial columns on nearly any other occasion.

This newspaper would find documented cases of the statutory rights of civil service workers abrogated contrary to law, a practice which I doubt would find editorial approval.

This newspaper would find documented cases of apparent perjury by high Government officials, another situation which should raise its journalistic ire.

This newspaper would find documented cases of denial of due process, and other fundamental constitutional rights, a subject which has always caused its editorial writers to whet their lips.

This newspaper would also find documented cases of the collapse of the State Department's security system. However, judging from its recent editorial, the newspaper could not be better pleased. Its unreasonable prejudice on this issue seems to have caused blindness on every other aspect of the case.

Mr. President, Mr. Otepka has long suffered at the hands of those who believe our security systems should be destroyed, and it is time that he received the justice due to him as a faithful civil servant and loyal patriot. It is time also that his country makes good use of the special talents and loyalty which he has brought to Government service in the past. I am confident that, whatever attacks are made upon him now by irresponsible journalism, the Senate will speedily confirm him when his nomination is brought to the floor.

AMERICAN CASUALTY FIGURES IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it was 1 year ago this week that President Johnson ordered a halt in all bombing north of the 19th parallel in North Vietnam. In October he eliminated all bombing of North Vietnam.

President Johnson's reasoning for his April restrictions and his October prohibition was the hope that this would result in a negotiated peace.

Peace talks began in Paris in early May. It was only recently that the conferees came to agreement on the shape of the table. So far as is known, no other conclusions have been reached. There is no evidence that peace is any nearer today than it was a year ago.

Yet while this country has eliminated all aerial action against North Vietnam, American casualties continue to mount.

It has been my belief for some months that the Paris talks have lulled the American people into a false sense of security—and have caused our troops to become the forgotten men.

Let us look at the facts.

During the 1-year period beginning last April, the United States has suffered 95,879 casualties in Vietnam, of which 12,866 were killed.

This is 39 percent of all the casualties the United States has suffered during its long involvement in Vietnam.

To state it another way, of the total casualties suffered in Vietnam, 39 per-

even rafts made of the inner-tubes of truck tires, in the greatest mass migration in the history of the Western Hemisphere. Another million and a half are waiting to get out. As applied to the population of the United States, this is the equivalent of the flight of between 40 and 50 million Americans.

Of the 87 Cubans who made it to freedom through a hail of Castro bullets last January 6, three-quarters of them were Negroes and mulattoes and most of those were youths. Almost exactly one year ago—on April 14, 1968—18 Cubans hijacked a train, drove it close to our Guantanamo Naval Base and, dodging machine-gun fire from Castro guards, made it to safety. *All were Negro youths.*

What is the root cause of these desperate flights, this mass migration? The answer is to be found in the lack of food and clothing, a stagnant economy, terror in the form of the most repressive policy apparatus known to this hemisphere and no future in a life being drained away in unending slogans dedicating the individual to the service of the state.

Using a scale of 100 for the year 1958, Cuban industrial production 10 years later stands at 63.9; beef and pork production stands at 46 per cent of the 1958 figure—and so it goes.

The much-touted youth support for the regime has been placed in doubt by none other than Fidel Castro. When 1.5 million youths were forced to work in the sugar cane fields, their reluctance to do so was scored by Castro, who accused them of "not having shown the revolutionary fervor expected of them."

They have been found by people tearing down or despoiling pictures of "Che" Guevara and have come under vicious and increasing attack in *Verde Olivo*, *El Mundo*, *Revolucion y Cultura* and other government organs for "capitalist corruption," "apolitical tendencies" and many other "crimes" in Castro's totalitarian Communist state.

Escapes from Cuba tell of anti-Communist slogans which appear with increasing frequency on the walls of high schools and at the University of Havana. *El Mundo* newspaper was burned to the ground a few weeks ago. Journalism students operated the paper and, in the aftermath of its destruction, many were arrested on suspicion of sabotage.

On January 5, Castro revealed that the malaise of youth had reached significant proportions. Students seem to have little interest in school and, according to the Cuban dictator, 621,000 elementary students out of a total of 1,444,000 failed to pass to the next grade. With only 172,000 students attending secondary (where is Castro's vast educational program, anyway?) Castro revealed that more than half failed to pass. Furthermore, he admitted, another 400,000 school-age children are not going to school at all.

Cuba's youths are becoming a serious threat to the Castro regime (as youths were to the Communist regime in Hungary in the mid-1950s). Despite the mobilization of spy cadres which operate within the school system and inform on "counterrevolutionary activities" of the students, and despite get-tough orders to the police in dealing with suspected sabotage activities, the defiance of Cuba's youth is growing, not diminishing.

Castro's reaction to this increasing opposition among Cuba's youths exploded in a March 13 speech at Havana University. So that he can punish minors under the adult penal code, he lowered the age of maturity from 21 to 16, an age, as he put it, "where they will face penal responsibilities." Minors who are "delinquents" (a term used to describe anyone who disagrees with him), he thundered, "raises the possibility that we'll have to eliminate them, radically!"

One means of controlling rebel youths, Castro continued, will be for the government to incorporate the military into the senior high school system (thus turning his propaganda line around, from "converting barracks into schools" to converting schools into barracks).

He said he would eliminate Havana University (a stronghold for anti-Castro student leadership) by splitting it up and scattering its various schools throughout the countryside where, he said "students can more easily fulfill their work and study responsibilities." In fact, he has eliminated the name "Havana University," in an attempt to destroy its tradition as a center for intellectual opposition. The resistance these recent changes will meet from aroused Cuban youths is not difficult to imagine.

Likewise, assertions made by "eyewitnesses" that the Cuban farmer is better off than ever before are open to serious challenge.

Why doesn't the on-the-spot reporter ask why it is necessary for the regime to empty schools, factories and shops and even close down whole cities and herd the population out to cut sugar cane, harvest rice and pick coffee? This massive and nonsensical dislocation of a precarious economy is often romanticized as "volunteer labor." But behind this phenomenon lie some facts that need exploring. Cuba has traditionally suffered from a surplus of farm labor, the *campesinos*. What it may logically be asked, has happened to them?

The answer is as simple as it is obvious. When Castro reneged on his promise, made back in 1959, to give each *campesino* his own piece of land, they rebelled en masse and have not worked for the regime in any significant number since. As a result, they are persecuted and harassed through every conceivable method available to the government. A typical monthly "ration" allowed to these stout rebels is 16 plantains (or the equivalent in sweet tubers) a month, supplemented by sugar mixed with water to give them energy!

Indeed, Cuba's *campesinos* provide the core of the anti-Castro rebels. Among their guerrilla leaders were Thondyke, "Machetero," "Yayo" Estevez, "Chungo" Ramirez, "Perico" Sanchez, "Cara Linda," Bernardo Corrales and others. As they were captured or shot, others took their places. Four of them were Negroes.

As late as July 22, 1967, Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro made this eye-opening statement regarding internal resistance: "To liquidate bands [of guerrillas], 179 in total, has cost us the precious lives of our youths and the equivalent of between 500 and 800 million U.S. dollars."

It is not known how many of the groups merely disbanded and still remained on the alert, as was the case with "Yayo" Estevez, and how many were actually "liquidated" in the literal meaning of Raul Castro's term. But by halving or even quartering the number of 179 anti-Castro guerrilla bands, it is obvious that organized resistance existed on a very large scale and may, in fact, exist today. Certainly, things are worse in 1969 than in 1967.

Further evidence of latent anti-Castro resistance came out at the famous trial of Anibal Escalante one year ago.

Escalante was accused of leading a coup against Castro. Russia's top security chief in Cuba, Rudolf Shilapnikov was quoted by Raul Castro in the course of the trial as follows: "In Cuba, conditions are present for a new Hungary... dissension is great," and, "In Hungary it was not the peasants that crushed the revolt... it fell on the State Security forces," which, in Cuba, Shilapnikov noted, was filled with "petit bourgeois."

There are two points here: One is that Cuban *campesinos* cannot be trusted (Raul Castro needed no reminder that this is so); the other is that Shilapnikov registered doubts about the loyalty of Cuba's police apparatus. Nothing could be clearer than that.

It may be significant, in this regard, that Castro's militia and his Vigilance Committees have had their arms taken away from them, while those conscripted into the Obligatory Military Service never even see a rifle. De-

scribed by most intelligence sources as "massively against the regime," conscriptees (about 150,000) are given only close-order drill. Their real job is to work in the fields doing only slightly disguised slave labor (they are paid \$7 a month.)

Here is a partial list of recent sabotage, and government directives to deal with it:

January 23, a shipyard was destroyed by fire at the southern Camaguey port of Santa Cruz del Sur. Radio Havana placed the loss at \$400,000.

January 25, the government announced "a 45-day revolutionary vigilante drive" against sabotage and mingled agents of the G-2 (secret service) into the civil population forced to cut sugar cane.

January 25, Havana Radio called "for information by revolutionary vigilantes leading to the discovery and unmasking of enemies of the revolution..."

January 26, a warehouse containing machine parts was burned in Santiago. A Leyland bus (from England) was also burned.

February 12, a government machine shop at Macareno sugar mill was burned out. Two weeks later a warehouse filled with sugar bags went up in smoke. On March 1, Radio Havana revealed another fire in a warehouse at Senado sugar mill.

February 19, the government announced even more stringent measures "for intensifying collective revolutionary vigilance... the prevention of counter-revolutionary, anti-social and criminal acts against the state..."

February 20, *El Mundo* newspaper burned to the ground.

Many small railway stations in the interior of the island have been burned down.

The point is that "evidence" produced by some reporters in on-the-spot investigations is not accompanied with more serious research to examine their conclusions that the Communist regime of Fidel Castro is solid. The regimes of Juan Peron, Rafael Trujillo, Marcos Perez Jimenez, Gustavo Rojas Pinilla, Fulgencio Batista, Joao Goulart and many others disappeared with lightning-like suddenness, typical in Latin America, with less evidence of popular discontent and rebellion than exists in Cuba.

Actually, Castro owes his continued existence, more than anything else, to the fact that agreements made at the time of the missile crisis prevent his opposition from receiving either arms or encouragement.

However that may be, the history of revolt in Communist countries warns us that even Cuba's status as a sanctuary against attack may not save Fidel Castro. The revolts in East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia teach us that after a certain length of time, people under the heel of a Communist dictatorship do rebel.

At some not-too-distant date in the future, we can almost predict that the Cuban people will join their European brothers in trying to throw off the yoke of their oppressors. The point then will not be to lament how wrong we have been, but how well prepared we are to help them.

Now there is something positive that a huge, tax-free foundation might undertake to study! Or are they, and a certain element in our press, trying to forestall a revolt by salvaging Castro before it happens?

HOW CASTRO'S RECORD IS DISTORTED BY PRESS

(By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

In their stories about life in Cuba after 10 years under the dictatorship of Fidel Castro, most national news magazines told it as it is. But a couple did not and, just for the record, they ought to be corrected.

Both *Newsweek* and the *New York Times Magazine*, while acknowledging such things as a decline in per capita income from \$422 a year in 1958 to \$415 in 1968, felt constrained to point out that despite this drop in income

CUBA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been a rising tide of pro-Castro propaganda in our news media which alleges that things are better in Cuba than ever before and that we might as well accept Castro as a permanent fixture and recognize his government.

The object of this propaganda is to convince the American public and to apply pressures against the administration to legitimize the Communist government off our shores. Thus, 10 years of waiting is supposed to accomplish for Castro what he could not do by force and with the aid of the Soviet military power. I cannot see how the passage of time affects the legitimacy of a totalitarian government.

Two articles in the current issue of *Human Events* give able refutation to the thesis that Castro's revolution is a success and is welcomed by the people. An article by Paul Bethel entitled "The Rising Tide of Pro-Castro Propaganda" gives ample detail which shows how the pro-Castro elements in the United States are conducting this campaign, and which also shows what the current economic situation is in Cuba.

Of particular interest is Mr. Bethel's catalog of recent instances of arson and sabotage against the Castro regime. Within a period of 1 month, he cites at least eight significant cases.

Mr. Bethel points out that many of the totalitarian regimes of Latin America disappeared with lightning-like suddenness with less evidence of popular discontent and rebellion than exists in Cuba. Why is it then that Castro stays in power? I quote Mr. Bethel's conclusion:

Castro owes his continued existence more than anything else to the fact that agreements made at the time of the missile crisis prevent his opposition from receiving either arms or encouragement.

The article by Mr. Lofton cites figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's periodical *Foreign Agriculture*. He shows how food production in 1968 was 10 percent less than the 1957-59 average. He points out that food production per capita has declined 25 to 30 percent.

Mr. President, I would like to congratulate *Human Events* for publishing these fine articles giving information which has seldom appeared in print. This is an example of fact-filled journalism which attempts to give an objective appraisal of a serious situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

THE RISING TIDE OF PRO-CASTRO PROPAGANDA
(By Paul Bethel)

Only the deaf and the blind can be unaware of the rising tide of pro-Castro propaganda appearing everywhere in recent months. And it just happens to coincide with President Nixon's preoccupation with ending the war in Vietnam and shoring up our neglected NATO alliance. Apparently the main purpose of the propaganda is to pressure the new Administration into reopening relations with Communist Cuba. A secondary objec-

tive is to stay President Nixon's hand in dealing more effectively than in the past with the threat posed by the Soviet bridge-head in this hemisphere.

The February 14 issue of *Life*, for example, carried a long piece on Cuba written by Carl Oglesby, former president of Students for a Democratic Society. Oglesby is said by *Life* to represent a "radical American view." But FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover sees the political direction of the SDS in quite a different light. In his year-end report, Mr. Hoover notes that at the organization's conference last summer, "two of the newly elected national officers publicly identified themselves as Communists. . . ." The FBI chief also states that the SDS has been "moved from an anarchistic outlook toward a Maoist-oriented, Marxist-Leninist approach."

First-hand reports on Cuba appearing on the television networks and in such newspapers as the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Christian Science Monitor* have also tried to turn the clock back 10 years to revive the mythologies purveyed by Herbert Matthews of the *New York Times*. But Matthews' personal assessment that Castro wasn't a Communist nor even a Communist sympathizer suggests that on-the-spot reports can be tragically wrong in their conclusions.

Nevertheless, the myths remain; only the message has been altered to reflect the changes wrought by a decade of Castro-Soviet rule. That message is this: The "revolution" may not be a social or economic success, but it is unshakable.

Shortages and misery that cannot be hidden from view (the result of disastrous Communist economic planning and civic resistance) are often explained away as the vestiges of pre-Castro "Yankee imperialism." Reporters are quick to allege that the *campesino* is living better than before Castro came to power. This excuses everything else—the brutalization of both government and the Cuban people.

Huge, tax-free foundations are playing a key role in spreading myths about the Cuban regime. The Ford Foundation, for instance, is the principal source of funds for National Educational Television, whose programs on Cuba have been very favorable toward Castro's rule.

The Center for Inter-American Relations of New York, recipient of a \$500,000 Ford Foundation grant, is also caught up in the resurging Castro myths. The Center is run by William D. Rogers, former deputy assistant secretary of state for Inter-American Affairs. His assistant is David Bronheim, who also served under Rogers at State.

At a meeting held on February 11, a study group of the Center was briefed by Lee Lockwood and Jose Yglesias on Cuba's cultural and economic advances. The commitment of these two gentlemen to pro-Castro causes is a matter of public record. Earlier, the forum had listened to the British ambassador to Cuba extol the virtues of Castro (he could hardly do otherwise and remain ambassador).

The most important meeting took place on February 25, when a "working paper" was presented on Cuba by Prof. Richard Fagan of Stanford University.

The group which was assembled to hear and approve Fagan's thesis seems to have been packed with members from the Left. Though he belonged to the forum, Jay Lovestone, head of the international division of the AFL-CIO, was not invited to attend. At a previous meeting Lovestone had discerned the conscious leftist purpose of the meetings and denounced them, saying that no such purpose could meet with the approval of the AFL-CIO. Former Ambassadors Robert C. Hill and Spruille Braden also did not receive invitations. Other members who were suspicious of softening our stance toward Cuba were also left out.

Suffice it to say that the composition of the February 25 meeting was not one to inspire confidence in its probity or objectivity. Among those attending were four members of the *New York Times* reporting staff (including Jose Yglesias), Lee Lockwood, three professors, a member of the Ford Foundation, an unidentified and silent observer and a lone businessman with widespread experience in Latin America. Thus the cards were all stacked on the Left. Prof. Fagan's paper, removed all doubt.

Here is what Fagan proposed:

1. Lift the ban on travel by U.S. citizens to Cuba;
2. Lift the U.S. economic blockade of the island;
3. Let the Organization of American States ease both travel and trade restrictions against Cuba.

A fourth point, which came up in the discussion in the context of trades which U.S. diplomats might be willing to make, was the return of the Guantanamo Naval Base to Cuba.

Points 1, 2 and 3 of the Fagan paper are a collective aberration. Fagan theorizes that if the Castro regime, in his words, "was to be enlaced throughout the hemisphere through trade, travel and diplomacy," then Castroite subversion would diminish. In fact, obviously, by extending aid in the form of trade and facilitating the travel of Castro agents (only Castro determines which Cubans may travel), subversion would not diminish, but increase.

In a transparent effort to gain the support of the U.S. business community, Fagan said: "Arrangements for trade fit well with the American business ethic," drawing a response from one of those present that Fagan's views represented a callous disregard for ethics as well as for American business.

Regarding any "diplomatic trade" of the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base, only the stupid or naive could doubt that by handing the base over to Castro we would, in fact, be handing it over to the Soviet navy.

The intellectual community (in this instance, as represented by the paper of Prof. Fagan) and much of our news media gloss over the threat which is posed to our security by Fidel Castro and his Soviet masters. From the very beginning, Fidel Castro's goal was to seize and exercise uncontrolled power.

He has not changed. Indeed, his goal is to extend that totalitarian control, by means of his subversives and with Soviet help, to Latin America. For, from the Marxist-Leninist point of view, the Cuban "revolution" can be considered a success only to the extent that it succeeds in enveloping Latin America and isolating the United States in its own hemisphere.

The size and power of the United States always cast a shadow over Castro's ambitions. He hates the capitalist system which lies at the heart of our power and influence. Upon seizing power, capitalism, American and Cuban, became the subject of his fury and the object of his attack. Only by our submitting to Castro's wishes and whims would even a frail coexistence with Castro become possible; it would break whenever the United States refused to do so. This was true in 1959; it is true in spades in 1969.

What are the realities of Fidel Castro's supposedly "unshakable" regime? The current myth is that the people of Cuba, particularly its youth and Negro population, are solidly behind him. It is important to Castro that this message be accepted by U.S. news media and our intellectual community, since it justifies the argument that we might as well learn to live with Castro.

Some of the news media refuse to be moved by obvious facts, treating them in passing as mere irrelevancies. One fact is that 500,000 Cubans have fled into exile, 10,000 of them braving the cruel seas in 1,017 small boats,

abundantly clear. It is high time our horse-and-buggy election procedures be overhauled and updated. The antiquated Electoral College must be replaced with an effective system which will let the people decide who will lead them.

It's not for lack of trying that there have been no reforms in the Electoral College since 1804. Despite inaction, more amendments have been proposed to reform the system than for any other single provision of the Constitution.

Since Jan. 6, 1797 when Congressman William L. Smith of South Carolina offered the first Constitutional amendment proposing election procedure reforms, more than 500 amendments have been proposed. More than 200 have been offered since 1947 alone.

In reviewing nomination and election procedures over the past 180 years, I have kept in mind three principal goals:

Elimination of blatantly undemocratic elements of the present system, such as denying meaningful participation by the people in the selection of party nominees and their election; independent voting by members of the Electoral College and run-off procedures in the House of Representatives.

Preservation of our traditional two-party system without eroding the strength of state and local parties. Without imposing unreasonable Federal controls party nominating procedures must be maintained, strengthened, and legalized under the Constitution.

Preservation of state responsibility for elections, where it has resided since our nation's founding. Only where essential uniformity and the principles of democracy demand should Federal standards be imposed.

This study has shown the need for ten basic changes to meet these goals. I will offer these proposals to amend our Constitution, which must be viewed as a living set of laws requiring occasional updating to meet the needs of an advancing society.

The Horton proposals include:

Abolishing the Electoral College.

Dividing the electoral vote, one vote for each Congressional District in each state, proportionally among the candidates based on the popular vote in individual states.

Requiring a 40 percent electoral vote margin, rather than a majority for the victor.

A run-off election for the top two candidates one week following the general election if no candidate received 40 percent of the electoral vote.

Polling the 50 state legislatures to determine voting age for persons voting for the Presidency. The majority decision would then become law under an act of Congress.

A Federal Election Commission to review election procedures, recommend changes and settle contested election results involving the Presidency.

Permitting persons to vote for the Presidency in the state where they were last eligible to vote regardless of local and state election residency requirements.

Equitable electoral vote for the District of Columbia.

Establish basic rules for National Party Convention, binding delegates to first ballot votes and providing for a run-off primary when no candidate receives a majority of delegate votes.

Five year population census to assure accurate figures to determine proportional assignment of Congressional Districts and electoral votes to the states.

At the time our Constitution was drafted, the Electoral College and its accompanying election procedures were the most democratic the world had ever seen. But that was in 1787. Now, 180 years later, with the great advances in education and communication our people have matured politically and the system is outdated.

These proposals will offer a more modern and responsive mechanism enabling the voice of the people to be heard more effectively.

As with any proposed Constitutional Amendments, it is essential to develop a plan agreeable to two-thirds of the members of each house of Congress and to 38 State Legislatures. In effect, 13 states can kill any amendment attempt. Thousands of amendments have been proposed for changes in the Constitution but only 25 were accepted.

ELECTORAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

In creating the Electoral College system, the authors of the Constitution intended that each State should choose its most distinguished citizens as electors. Once the electors had been selected it was expected that they would deliberate and vote as individuals in choosing the President.

With the early emergence of political parties, it quickly developed that electors were chosen to represent those parties. Designation as a candidate for elector by the party leadership became an honor to those who had served the party well. By 1800 independent voting by electors had almost, but not entirely, disappeared.

Responding to pressure for popular control, the practice of choosing electors by popular vote quickly developed. By 1832, direct election was the rule in all States except South Carolina, which made the change at the time of the Civil War.

The practice of giving all the electors to the party which wins the most votes in the States, the "general ticket" or "unit rule" system, is also a product of the early 1800's.

THE MOVEMENT FOR REFORM

From the start, the method of electing the President has been a subject of debate and discussion. At the Constitutional Convention, a few key members, including James Madison, Benjamin Franklin and Gouverneur Morris, favored direct popular election. Others preferred to see the President elected by Congress or the State Governors.

One of the arguments for the Electoral College system was that through the provisions for at least three electors regardless of population it gave the small States some protection against domination by large States. It was felt that to preserve our Federal system of Government, this was an important consideration and the argument went far in swaying the Convention.

Another important argument was that it placed the choice of the President in the hands of persons presumably able to become acquainted personally with the various Presidential candidates, as the mass of people at that time were not.

The mass media, particularly television, have changed this drastically. Today's Presidential candidates are exposed, analyzed and interpreted to a degree never conceived by the Founding Fathers.

Numerous criticisms have been directed at the existing election system. Custom and tradition have greatly altered the operation of the system as it was originally created. Some criticism is directed at the original system, others at the aspects of its development.

Three major areas of criticism have evolved:

The office of Presidential elector, particularly the prospect of the so-called "Faithless Maverick," an elector who votes against the mandate of the voters who elected him.

The unit rule giving a state's entire electoral vote to the candidate with the most votes, be it a one-vote plurality or a 2,000,000 vote majority.

Prospects that an election could be thrown into the House of Representatives where each state would have one vote regardless of population.

ELECTORAL PROCESS CONFUSING

The presence of electors in the electoral process is confusing to some voters. Thirty five states, including New York, do not even carry the names of the electors on their ballots. A few states provide for listing only the

names of the electors and not the actual candidates.

Reform proposals have included direct voting, proportional voting, district voting and automatic or "non elector" plans.

Proposals for the direct election of the President of the United States date back to 1826 when Congressman William McManus of New York offered the first amendment on direct voting. Since then more than 100 proposals have been made. In the 90th Congress alone 15 amendments were offered to establish a direct voting system.

The seriousness of the electoral college crisis becomes obvious when we realize that 15 of our 37 presidents have been elected with less than a majority of the vote. Most direct voting proponents urge a 40 percent plurality requirement.

On November 5, 1968, we elected Richard M. Nixon as President with 43.4 percent of the vote, a mere .7 percent margin over Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. Third party candidate George Wallace polled 13.5 percent of the vote. Despite the closeness of the popular vote Nixon had a clear electoral edge: 302-191-45, in the unofficial tally.

MINORITY PRESIDENTS

The term "minority" President is loosely used and creates an erroneous impression.

Actually we have had only three minority Presidents—that is, a candidate elected President with a smaller number of popular votes than his closest opponent.

In 1824, Andrew Jackson received more electoral votes and more popular votes than did John Quincy Adams but the election fell into the House of Representatives, which gave a majority of its votes to Adams, electing him President.

In 1876, Samuel J. Tilden received a majority of more than 250,000 popular votes over Rutherford B. Hayes. The returns from Florida, Louisiana, Oregon, and South Carolina were contested. An electoral commission, created by Congress to settle the dispute, decided the contested returns in favor of Hayes, who won by one electoral vote.

Grover Cleveland received a popular plurality of about 100,000 votes over Benjamin Harrison in 1888. Cleveland obtained only 168 electoral votes, and Harrison with 233 electoral votes was elected President.

Twelve other Presidents failed to obtain a majority of the popular vote but all these men, except Abraham Lincoln, did receive a plurality of 40 percent or more.

In 1860 Abraham Lincoln was elected President with only 39.79 percent of the popular vote. U.S. Senator Stephen A. Douglas had received 29.40 percent and Vice President John C. Breckinridge 19.2 percent. Lincoln had 180 electoral votes, a clear majority; Breckinridge, 72; and Douglas 12. Fourth party candidate John Bell had 39 electoral votes with 12.6 percent of the vote.

James K. Polk was elected President in 1844 with 49.56 percent of the vote compared with 48.13 percent of the vote for Henry Clay. Four years later Zachary Taylor received 47.13 percent of the vote in beating Lewis Cass who had 42.47 percent.

Woodrow Wilson was elected in 1912 with 41.85 percent of the popular vote. He led Theodore Roosevelt who had 27.42 percent and then President William H. Taft who had 23.5 percent.

The Presidential race in 1960 saw John F. Kennedy win with 49.71 percent of the vote while Richard M. Nixon had 49.55 percent. Kennedy, however, had 303 electoral votes to 219 for Nixon.

Harry S. Truman, Grover Cleveland, James A. Garfield, and James Buchanan also were elected with a plurality but less than a majority of the vote cast.

The major argument in favor of direct voting is that it would give more meaning to the individual vote. Direct election would eliminate the "unit rule" under the present electoral system and prevent a candidate from

ticular physical configuration—the coverage we get is excellent.”

Midnight, the police horse, works only in the summertime. During the winter he spends his time at a local pasture enjoying life. On a recent visit to check him, Porteus laughed when asked about the array of leather straps and pieces of metal in the rear of his car. “I’m probably the only police chief around,” said Porteus, “with 20 pounds of horse bridle in his car.” Midnight seemed to recognize the chief, and snorted an official greeting.

U.S. FOREIGN AID FOR CUBA?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Castro has successfully exploited U.S. hijacked planes into a sizable profit—foreign aid of \$32,000. And once more the expense and inconvenience of tolerating communism at our back door comes home to haunt us.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Stephen M. Aug's column in the Evening Star for December 25, 1968, as follows:

FEES OF \$32,000 PAID CUBA IN 13 HIJACKINGS THIS YEAR

(By Stephen M. Aug)

The nation's airlines have paid the Cuban government about \$32,000 this year in assorted fees resulting from hijacking incidents—and so far, apparently, nobody is complaining the price is too high, a Star survey finds.

Following each of the 13 instances in which a United States commercial airliner has been forced to Cuba, the airline has received a carefully itemized bill signed by William R. Jochimsen, chief of the State Department's Protection and Representation Division, calling for “a remittance in the form of a certified check, bank draft or money order made payable to the Department of State.”

The remittances are averaging \$2,500 and the airlines are paying it promptly.

The State Department, of course, doesn't set the fees. They are determined by the Cubans and forwarded to the Swiss Embassy in Havana, which handles U.S. affairs in Cuba. The accounting is forwarded to the State Department.

But the \$2,500 average takes into account only the direct charges for landing in Cuba. There are other costs—overtime for the crew, a plane out of service for 15 hours or more, substitute planes to handle other regular flights in this country, the costs of additional accommodations for passengers, the cost of flying them back to this country.

One published figure—attributed to Pan American Airways—puts the cost of a hijacking at \$35,000 to \$50,000. But Pan Am officials could not confirm this price. An Eastern Air Lines official says the Sept. 20 hijacking of its San Juan-bound Boeing 720 with 53 persons aboard cost \$10,787.50 just in cash expenses.

The charges for landing a hijacked plane in Cuba, however, vary. Eastern lists the charges as \$2,348.50 for the Sept. 20 hijacking; \$3,277.92 for the Nov. 23 hijacking, and \$2,472 for the one on Nov. 30.

Pan Am has received a bill for \$2,745 from the Cuban government for the needs of its crew and plane hijacked with 36 passengers on Nov. 24. National Airlines, which has had four hijackings this year, says it has paid bills ranging from about \$2,500 to \$2,700.

The assorted charges levied by the Cubans can range from \$5.05 for weather forecasting

from Cuban airports to \$749.22 for the cost of lunch for the hijacked plane's passengers and crew. In the case of Eastern's Sept. 20 hijacking, this amounted to \$14.13 per person for lunch and the same for dinner.

But both airline and State Department officials say the charges are not excessive—although they are in some instances considerably higher than charges made in this country for airport-related services. A State Department official notes that “fuel in Cuba could be expensive—not for political reasons, but for economic reasons.”

“Acceptable items of food would be more costly than we would believe reasonable, but only because they are out of the ordinary items of food available in the general markets.”

The domestic airline with the most experience in hijacking is Eastern. It has had five in 1968—four of them going all the way to Cuba—and all originating at or destined for Miami.

Despite this, the chances of being aboard a hijacked plane are slim. Eastern has a plane entering or leaving Miami every six minutes, making the odds 100,000 to 1.

Other domestic airlines having planes hijacked this year are—Delta 2, although one attempt was stopped; Southeast 1; Northwest 1; Trans World 1 and 1 unsuccessful attempt; Pan Am 1.

AN ITEMIZED HIJACKING BILL

Here is the bill from the State Department to Eastern Air Lines detailing the payment to be made to the Cuban government for the September 20 hijacking of a Boeing 720 jetliner (English translation is approximate):

Derechos de aterrizaje (landing fee)	\$225.00
Servicios de handling (handling costs)	354.00
Derechos de estacionamiento (parking)	31.25
Derechos por servicios de aduana (duties)	12.50
Derechos por servicios de meteorología (weather services)	5.05
Servicios de comisaria (commissary)	132.55
Servicios de comisaria	19.00
Servicios de restaurant (almuerzo) (lunch)	749.22
Servicios de restaurant (comida) (dinner)	749.22
15 percent recargo por operacion nocturna (night operations surcharge)	70.80
Total	2,348.50

NO PRAYERS IN OUTER SPACE?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for Members of Congress one of the highlights of the Apollo 8 adventure was the appearance of the astronauts before a joint session of Congress last week. In his remarks Col. Frank Borman, remembering the confusion caused by the Supreme Court in ruling on the issues of Bible reading and prayer in the public schools, struck a chord of contention among American citizens if the instantaneous reaction of those present in the House Chamber is any indication.

Human Events, the Washington news-weekly, led off its Washington news column in its issue of January 18 with

this tongue-in-cheek query: “No Prayers in Outer Space?” I include this short, incisive item in the RECORD at this point:

NO PRAYERS IN OUTER SPACE?

The Apollo 8 astronauts—Col. Frank Borman, Capt. James A. Lovell Jr. and Lt. Col. William A. Anders—were hailed as heroes when they appeared before a joint session of Congress last week. While tales of their Superman exploits intrigued the lawmakers, Col. Borman, taking notice of the Supreme Court justices in the front row, made a remark that brought down the house.

“Now, as you all know,” said Borman, “the flight has been very well covered, but there was one significant accomplishment that has gone rather unnoticed, and I would like to take note of it today if I may.”

“I think that one of the things that was truly historic was that we were able to get good Roman Catholic Bill Anders to read the first four verses of the King James version.”

“But now that I see the gentlemen here in the front row,” Borman remarked of the justices, “I am not sure we should have read the Bible at all.”

RESEARCH PAPER ON ELECTORAL REFORM

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, events of the past year once again demonstrated the need for reform of the process by which we select our Chief Executive. Fortunately we were able to avoid—this year—the shoals in the electoral college system. The fact remains that every presidential election is a gamble with chaos.

Recently one of our colleagues, the distinguished Member from New York (Mr. HORTON) prepared a series of articles for distribution in his congressional district in which he discusses the dangers and inadequacies in the procedures by which we nominate and elect the President.

In these articles he outlines a 10-point program of electoral reform, encompassing the nominating process as well as the general election.

I think that you will agree with me that this is a monumental work. The articles of the gentleman from New York cover the history of our electoral process. And while we may have differing ideas about the specifics of reform, his proposals make up one of the most comprehensive plans I have studied.

In total, this work is an excellent research paper on electoral reform, and the proposals lay the foundation for further discussion.

Our colleague from New York deserves our commendation for his work, and I recommend his articles to you. I insert them in the RECORD at this point:

HORSE-AND-BUGGY ELECTION PROCEDURES NEED OVERHAULING SAYS CONGRESSMAN HORTON

(NOTE.—A paper prepared by Congressman FRANK HORTON, of New York, outlining extensive details for updating U.S. election and nominating procedures.)

The election of the 37th President of the United States in 1968 has made one thing

tion in municipal, County and State governmental areas. Our organization has consistently and actively supported the Minnesota Department of Highways in its policy of dual public hearings and early public involvement. The record proves conclusively that Minnesota Good Roads, Incorporated, far from questioning or condemning public involvement in the location of highways, aggressively encourages said involvement.

That being established, I now wish to state that our organization and, in view of my special experience in highway matters, I, particularly, are unalterably opposed to the addition of the proposed new Part 3 to Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations. Unalterably, Sir!

We gravely question the constitutionality of the proposed super-imposed regulations, and are shockingly upset by the likely social, political, economic, and public safety consequences if these ill-advised regulations are forced upon the citizens and taxpayers of the United States of America.

I am not a constitutional lawyer, nor yet a lawyer at all, but my training and experience enable me to detect the ominous significance of proposed Section 3.1 applicability:

"A. This part applies to all Federal Aid Highway projects."

Gentlemen, that is the meat of it: meat for the bottomless appetites of Federal bureaucrats.

These proposed regulations are a gross invasion of the reserved and inherent powers of the several States of the Union. They would usurp a primary responsibility of the State Highway Commissioners by placing final authority for virtually all highway location and construction in the hands of the Federal Highway Administrator. They give him control of intrastate as well as interstate construction, and this must not be!

Governor Volpe of Massachusetts, Secretary-designate of the Department of Transportation, puts it in a nutshell. The proposed rule would "remove the power of location selection from the States and place it in the hands of Federal authorities who are removed from the many intricacies of each project."

Gentlemen, surely you are even more aware than I that these proposed regulations probably violate the Constitution of the United States and surely violate the intent of Congress. I beg you to abandon this reckless, headstrong course of action.

Should you, in fact, activate these proposed regulations, I foresee chaos.

I speak from peculiar and painful experience.

Minnesota is unusual in that it is one of a handful of States with a law absolutely requiring that any highway construction contract entered into within or immediately adjacent to a municipality must be consented to by the governing body of that municipality. We now know that Minnesota motorists have paid a high price indeed for the absolute right of a municipality to veto any non-interstate highway plan. The price has been paid in such expensive coin as delay, disruption, inconvenience, bickering and, all too often, death.

By injecting these new rules promulgated by the Federal Highway Administration into our already restrictive situation, there will be many roads, streets, and highways, now desperately needed, that will never be built because of lack of agreement between different levels of government. When I inform you that Saturday, December 14th, 1968, Minnesota, for the first time in its entire history, recorded its 1,000th highway traffic death within a calendar year, you can understand the depth of my concern.

We need more roads, better roads . . . and we need them now! We cannot endure additional bureaucratic delays!

It has wisely been said that: "Justice delayed is justice denied". Highway construction delayed is more than highway construction denied; it is transportation denied; it is social justice denied; it is economy denied; it is public safety denied!

Yet the appellate provisions of 3.17 virtually seek out objections and delays by permitting but one disgruntled person to halt any construction project. As you well know, the filing of such an appeal with the Federal Highway Administration would automatically stop further progress until the appeal is settled. To make matters worse: the proposed regulations impose no time limit on the Federal Highway Administrator with which to make his decision on an appeal. This, gentlemen, is indeed a mockery of justice!

Under the seductive disguise of affording "effective public participation in the consideration of highway location and design proposals", the proposed new regulations would effectively cripple State, County and local highway construction while robbing the several States of their constitutional heritage.

As Edmund Burke remarked in 1784, "The people never give up their liberties but under some delusion". Your proposed regulations, gentlemen, are the great delusion of this decade.

Again, I beg you to withdraw these proposed rules and regulations.

THE CASTLE VALLEY JOB CORPS CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTER NEAR PRICE, UTAH

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 14, 1969

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Castle Valley Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center near Price, Utah, operated for the Office of Economic Opportunity by the Bureau of Land Management, is now over 3 years old. The Salt Lake City Tribune has aptly stated:

An unwanted stranger in town has an uphill fight to establish a good reputation.

I am pleased to note today, over 3 years later, that the people of our State have welcomed the Job Corpsmen into the community to the point where the city council of Price adopted a resolution praising the Castle Valley Center corpsmen and staff and recommending its continuance. I concur with the statement in the editorial "The Image Is Mended" to the effect that—

They are increasingly being welcomed is a credit to the Job Corps and the home folks alike.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the editorial and the resolution be inserted in the Extensions of Remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Sept. 21, 1968]

AN IMAGE IS MENDED

An unwanted stranger in town has an uphill fight to establish a good reputation. This has been the experience of more than one Job Corps center throughout the country.

Many communities initially resented having a center dropped in their midst. Sometimes incidents involving corpsmen and local citizens or police added to the resentment. But as center administrators

and personnel became more experienced in guiding their youthful charges into projects benefitting the host communities ugly incidents declined and resentment has many times turned to appreciation.

Not long ago the mayor and City Council of Price adopted a resolution praising corpsmen at nearby Castle Valley Civilian Conservation Center, operated by the Bureau of Land Management, for their good conduct and many material contributions to the city. Similar commendation for other centers has come from various civic and government bodies.

This change in community attitude is testimony of what can be accomplished by mutual respect and willingness to reserve judgment. Job Corpsmen come to town under many disadvantages. That they are increasingly being welcomed is a credit to the Job Corps and the home folks alike.

RESOLUTION OF PRICE, UTAH, MUNICIPAL CORP.

Whereas, the Job Corps located south of Price, Utah, has been of substantial economic benefit to the people of this community and the citizens of Price, Utah, in that much useful work has been done by the Job Corps of lasting benefit to this area and the economy of the County has been advanced thereby, and

Whereas, the Job Corp has provided needed schooling and training for the members, thus improving their education and ability to later to be of help to the welfare of our society and to earn their own way and raise their living standards, and

Whereas, the members of the Job Corps on the whole have been law-abiding and have shown respect for the laws and the rights of the people of this community, and

Whereas, they have assisted in doing useful and necessary work for the benefit of this community when their assistance has been requested,

Therefore, be it Resolved that the Mayor and City Council of Price, hereby commend the Job Corps and its Officers and members for the excellent work it is doing for the betterment and improvement of this area and the advancement and development of its members and the moral and spiritual uplift it is providing for its members in addition to all of the economic improvement which is derived from the Job Corps, and

Be it further resolved that we recommend the continuance of this program.

MURRAY MATHIS,

Mayor.

HAROLD O. PATTERICK,
WALTER T. AXELGARD,
JAMES FAUSSETT,
GUIDO RACHIELE,
MACK BUDGE,

Councilmen.

SIMPLE JUSTICE FOR CONSCIENTIOUS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a bill which gives simple justice to the many conscientious Federal employees who use their sick leave only when they are ill. At present, the sick leave accumulated by the majority of civil servants who retire without disability saves their Government a considerable sum, but does not benefit them at all. My bill would permit these employees the option of receiving full credit for each day of accumulated sick leave in computing their retirement benefits,

January 14, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 203

Cuba

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 14, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, several weeks ago, there appeared in the magazine *Commonweal* an article commenting upon the book "13 Days," authored by our late colleague, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, concerning the 1962 Cuban missile crisis—a crisis in which he played a central role as adviser and confidant of his brother, the late President Kennedy.

Written by former State Department official Roger Hilsman, the *Commonweal* article deals with an analysis of the book from an "insiders" point of view, for Mr. Hilsman has an active part in the Kennedy administration at the time of the 1962 Cuban confrontation.

I recommend Mr. Hilsman's article to all Senators as a worthy contribution to our better understanding of one of the most crucial events in the history of the Nation. I ask that it be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

R. F. K. ON CUBA: AN INSIDER'S ANALYSIS
(By Roger Hilsman)

Robert Kennedy's *Thirteen Days* is unique—an account of the world's first nuclear crisis by a man who shared presidential responsibility. For of all of the men around John F. Kennedy in those fateful days, only Robert F. Kennedy, his brother, could feel the personal sense that John Kennedy did of responsibility for all of mankind and for generations yet unborn. It is the closest thing we will ever have to the reflections of John F. Kennedy himself.

The awesome drama of those thirteen days, the tension, the clashing wills of patriotic, intelligent, but overwrought men of deeply differing convictions is all here. This manuscript was a first-draft, and Robert Kennedy had intended to polish and edit it. But, in a way, the first-draft roughness, contributes to the drama of the account, conveying something of the striving for deliberateness in the midst of overwhelming pressure for speed.

Some commentators have said that there is nothing in Robert Kennedy's account that had not already appeared. But as one who was himself involved in those events as the Director of the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, I believe that judgment is unfair. There are no "now-it-can-be-told" state secrets revealed, but there is still much that is new.

First, of course, is the account of how John Kennedy felt, how he saw the crisis, and both his and Robert Kennedy's joint reflections on the lessons to be learned. This is new. John Kennedy was determined to avoid recrimination or exultation in his dealing with the Soviet Union and to take the opportunity to move to achieve agreements, such as the limited nuclear test ban agreement, that would help to end the Cold War, and he refrained from confiding his feelings about the crisis to anyone but his brother.

Other details are also new. Robert Kennedy gives a much fuller account than has ever before appeared in print of the long,

four-part cable that Chairman Khrushchev sent the afternoon of Friday, Oct. 26. This cable marked the turning point in the Soviet attitude and was the basis of the agreement that resolved the crisis. Kennedy also documents what had only been deduced before about the course events would probably have taken if the Soviets had not backed down—the United States would have been forced to take out the Soviet anti-aircraft SAM sites, and, then, if the Soviets still persisted, to launch an invasion.

Many other details are also new, but one is particularly significant—the account of Robert Kennedy's meeting with Ambassador Dobrynin, the details of which supply a missing link that has puzzled historians. There has long been speculation that something happened Saturday Oct. 27, that finally convinced the Soviets just how determined the Americans were and caused them to recognize the full gravity of the situation. Kennedy's account of his meeting with Dobrynin provides the explanation. For Robert Kennedy was able to make it clear how events must inevitably proceed, how short time was before events took command, and yet to do so without threats or posturing.

The final section of *Thirteen Days* is devoted to reflections on the crisis and on the lessons learned. Here, Robert Kennedy is speaking to future Presidents and other officials who will sit around that same table making other fateful decisions. And what he has to say is worthy of their attention.

It is at this point, however, that a criticism must be made. Once during the crisis, a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that he believed in a preventive attack on the Soviet Union. Others advocated attacks on Cuba without warning. "They seemed always to assume," Kennedy writes, "that the Russians and the Cubans would not respond or, if they did, that a war was in our national interest." There is no question that these remarks were made, but it is also clear that the deliberated positions taken by the Joint Chiefs of Staff were more responsible and took greater account of the proper limitations of military advice. The inability to look beyond the limited military field illustrated by these remarks appalled Robert Kennedy and led him to the sharp judgment given in the manuscript. But had he lived to go over it once more, he might well have made some changes. For he quotes John Kennedy in a different vein: "When we talked about this later, he said we had to remember that they were trained to fight and to wage war—that was their life. Perhaps we would feel even more concerned if they were always opposed to using arms or military means—for if they would not be willing, who would be?"

One final observation must be made. Because Robert Kennedy is the author of this account, his own role is played down. But the truth of the matter is that Robert Kennedy's role was central, second only to that of his brother. And on two occasions his contribution was the higher. On Friday night, Oct. 19, support in the ExCom for blockading Cuba as the first step began to fall apart, with more and more members shifting to the idea of opening with a bombing strike against the missile sites. It was Robert Kennedy who eloquently, even passionately, argued against an "American Pearl Harbor"—and who won the day.

The second occasion was on Saturday, Oct. 27, the blackest day of the crisis. The night before Khrushchev's long cable seemed to open the door to a resolution. This was reinforced by a very specific set of proposals delivered informally by the representative of Soviet intelligence in their Washington embassy to an American newsmen. Then on Saturday, the Soviets reneged in a message

broadcast from Moscow, and a U-2 was shot down over Cuba, killing the pilot, Major Anderson. There seemed no alternative to bombing the missile sites, and following this with an invasion.

But it was Robert Kennedy who conceived a brilliant diplomatic maneuver—later dubbed the "Trollope ploy," after the recurrent scene in Anthony Trollope's novels in which the girl interprets a squeeze of her hand as a proposal of marriage. His suggestion was to deal with Friday's package of signals—Khrushchev's cable and the approach through the Soviet intelligence agent—as if the reneging message of Saturday simply did not exist. Picking out of the various signals those items which the United States found acceptable, Robert Kennedy drafted a message to Khrushchev. At the President's direction, he then had his crucial conversation with Dobrynin, as described above. And the crisis was resolved.

There is no doubt of the debt that America—and all of humankind—owes to Robert F. Kennedy.

NEW HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS MAY SLOW DOWN CONSTRUCTION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, during this past month, I was besieged by calls from county commissioners and State organizations and officials regarding the proposed change in Federal or interstate highway location regulations.

Upon checking with these and other authorities, I then submitted a statement to the Department urging them to extend the hearing or to delay such hearings in order that all segments of administrative agencies dealing with highway location and construction become thoroughly aware of the drastic changes being proposed.

I also received a copy of the statement made at the Department of Transportation hearing by the president of the Minnesota Good Roads Association which I believe point up the ramifications of these broad proposals. The president, Mr. Frank Marzittelli, was formerly deputy highway commissioner in Minnesota, and is able to speak authoritatively on this subject. I commend the reading and study of his statement which follows:

Mr. Chairman, my name is Frank D. Marzittelli, and I have ventured here from St. Paul, Minnesota. Formerly I served as Deputy Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Highways. Currently I am Executive Vice President of the Port Authority of the City of St. Paul. I also am President of Minnesota Good Roads, Incorporated, and I primarily appear before you in the latter capacity.

Minnesota Good Roads, Incorporated is an organization composed of interested and concerned citizens who urgently believe that Minnesota's industrial and economic development hinges upon a growing transportation system that can effectively and expeditiously move goods and people. For 75 years our organization has been a leader in efforts to improve Minnesota's highway transporta-